Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library
BV660 .R263
Ray, Jefferson Davis MAIN
Highest office : a study of the aims and
3 9967 00208 7075

ACCESSION NUMBER 51937 SHELF NUMBER BV660R263

The Virginia Library

McCormick
Theological Seminary

of the

Presbyterian Church, Chicago

825 Belden Avenue

From

Received June 1923

The Highest Office

The Highest Office

A Study of the Aims and Claims of the Christian Ministry

By
JEFF D. RAY
Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology in the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas

VIRGINIA LIBRARY
RICHMOND
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

NEW YORK CHICAGO
Fleming H. Revell Company
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

Copyright, 1923, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

YALE DIVINITY
LIBRARY
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 17 North Wabash Ave.
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 75 Princes Street

660
R263

To those noble comrades

The Faculty and Students of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary,

whose confidence, affection and fellowship are prized among life's most priceless jewels, this volume is lovingly dedicated by

The Author

A Word Extenuative

DRYDEN said, "It is not my intention to make an apology for my poem. Some will think it needs no excuse and others will receive none." But lawyers have what they call "the plea of confession and avoidance" in which the defendant admits the act with which he is charged but gives reasons why he should not suffer its penalty. For perpetrating this volume upon an innocent and unsuspecting public this mitigative plea is here and now made and is based upon the following statement of facts:

So far as I am aware four things have prompted the publication of this book. (1) That invisible microbe that inspires every theological professor with the desire to perpetrate a book. (2) Most of the chapters in this book have been delivered in various conferences and conventions, and on all such occasions there has been a general and apparently sincere request for their publication. (3) A publisher while not insistent that they "would fill a long-felt want" admits that he could print them without fear of imprisonment or bankruptcy. (4) The feeling, I hope modestly cherished, that long experience in the pastorate and more than a decade of teaching pastoral theology in a seminary

has qualified me to say a helpful word to some of my younger brethren. My devout prayer is that the suggestions herein made may help to save a young brother here and there from the mistakes that have marred my own ministry and hearten him with the things that have encouraged and helped me.

There is no conscious plagiarism in this book but there is certainly nothing original nor even new in it. All it contains I have either read or heard or observed or experienced.

Grateful acknowledgment is made of the help derived from the writings of Herrick Johnson, J. M. Hoppin, C. E. Jefferson, and above all from the personal teaching and influence of B. H. Carroll. It is unblushingly confessed that if there are worth-while thoughts in the book they have probably been derived directly or indirectly from one or the other of these noble men, or from other good men of whom they are a worthy type.

J. D. R.

Seminary Hill,
Fort Worth, Tex.

Contents

I.	The Basis of the Office	11
II.	The Titles of the Office	25
III.	The Titles of the Office (*Continued*)	44
IV.	The Call to the Office	65
V.	The Permanence of the Office	84
VI.	The Maintenance of the Office	100
VII.	Some Qualifications for the Office —Physical and Mental	127
VIII.	Some Qualifications for the Office —Moral and Spiritual	142
IX.	Some Modern Demands of the Office	168
X.	The Non-Official Functions of the Office	203
XI.	Some Lowering Shadows of the Office	225
XII.	Some Insidious Snares of the Office	239
XIII.	Some Glorious Rewards of the Office	256
XIV.	The Bishop-Coadjutor of the Office	272

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

I

THE BASIS OF THE OFFICE

"How shall they hear without a preacher?"
—ROMANS 10: 14.

EVERY office in a well-ordered government has its justifying psychological basis. One of the abuses of government is that the people are often confused with many useless offices and burdened with the support of a horde of unnecessary officials that have persisted for generations after the justifying psychological basis has ceased to exist. There was a time when England was governed by a king. For generations, however, she has had a government of the people and by the people. And yet the office of king has persisted and its figurehead incumbent continues to speak with Don Quixotic bombast of "my army" and "my navy" and "my subjects." Even in our own more modern government there is a constant tendency to perpetuate obsolete offices and appoint and pay men to perform antiquated official functions "more honoured in the breach than in the observance."

We come, to discuss an office that has persisted in its present form and under its present titles for

nineteen centuries. Was there ever a good and sufficient reason for the institution of this office? Or, granting that it was once a useful and necessary office, has it outlived its usefulness? Has the twentieth century incumbent of the pastoral office become a religious figurehead, or does he fill an important, vital, practical and necessary place? Is the preacher a mechanically animated skeleton brought over from the shades of the first century and thrust into the arena of twentieth century activities in which he plays no vital part? Or is the preacher of to-day a virile force, an essential factor in moulding the modern social mind and directing modern activities? A little careful thinking will compel an affirmative answer to the last question. An observant, unbiased, thoughtful man must see that the pastoral office is not a sinecure position to which men are arbitrarily appointed, but that it is one that has its solid, justifying basis in the very nature of things.

Let us consider some proofs of this proposition. To begin with, then, *we find adequate justification for the pastoral office in a universal need for it.* Paul clearly teaches that the gospel preacher is directly and specifically set apart to his office by the sovereign will of God. But he guards against the inference that the institution of this office and the calling of men to fill it was an arbitrary act of God. He teaches, rather, that the office was created and men called into it in answer to an inher-

ent, essential and universal need of the human heart. In Acts 17: 26–27, he says: "And he made of one blood every nation of man to dwell in all the face of the earth, having before determined their appointed seasons, and the bounds of their habitations; that they should seek God if haply they might feel after him and find him, though he is not far from each one of us." This language clearly implies that the universal man—the man of every nation—has a capacity and a heart hunger for God; and that the universal man instinctively "feels after God." But the language distinctly intimates that this unaided intuitive struggle after God will probably be in vain. His expression "if haply" more than suggests that if these untaught seekers find God it will be an accident. The meaning of his expression "feeling after God" is not illustrated by the germinating seed that unerringly feels out through the dull clod for light and air. It answers rather to the figure of a blindfolded child aimlessly beating the air in a confused and vain search for its playmate.

Paul points out the same universal need when he inquires (Rom. 10: 14), "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?" The thought is that though man may have a zeal for God (Rom. 10: 2), he will not come into saving relation to God unless there shall

be sent to him a preacher—a man appointed and qualified to interpret divine things. This idea is strengthened if we remember that the word here translated "preacher" has in it etymologically the idea of a herald especially qualified and formally appointed.

When standing on the western shore of Asia, Paul saw a man on the eastern shore of Europe beckoning to him for help, he witnessed a whole continent's mute confession that, while men everywhere feel after God they cannot find Him unless some qualified teacher "come over and help" them.

Later, while standing in Athens, the very heart of human culture, Paul saw an altar to an "unknown God," he saw further proof of the twofold proposition that the highest human culture hungers for God, and that, unaided by a God-appointed preacher, the highest human culture cannot find Him.

The same truth was emphasized when the Ethiopian treasurer admitted to Philip on the Gaza road that he could not understand the spiritual meaning of God's word without a qualified teacher. "Understandest thou what thou readest?" "How can I except some man (some qualified man) teach me?"

Job was speaking the universal human language when he said, "Surely I would speak to the Almighty and I desire to reason with him" (Job 13: 3).

The Samaritan woman (John 4: 25) was interpreting to Jesus the world's heart hunger and earnest expectation and conscious need when she said to Him, "I know that the Messiah cometh, and when he is come he will teach us all things."

Socrates, a heathen philosopher whose utterances sometimes almost seem inspired, felt the need of such a divinely appointed and divinely qualified teacher, and not only foretold his coming, but begged his disciples to hear him when he came.

A Vedic poet voiced his heart search for the altar stairs leading up to the divine footstool in the line, "Who is the God whom we should revere?" A later generation showed how vain is the unaided search for God by interpreting the poet's noble words to mean, "There is a god called Who and we should make sacrifices to Who." And in later generations the priests were required to make two sets of offerings, one to a god called Who and one to a God called Whom—as separate deities. Thus the innate human instinct for God utters its cry and thus the untaught human hand answers that cry by building altars to an unknown and an unknowable God.

In his introduction to Hiawatha, Longfellow said:

> "Ye whose hearts are fresh and simple,
> Who have faith in God and nature,
> Who believe that in all ages
> Every human heart is human;

That in even savage bosoms
There are longings, yearnings, strivings
For the good they comprehend not;
That the feeble hands and helpless
Groping blindly in the darkness
Touch God's right hand in that darkness,
And are lifted up and strengthened—
Listen to this simple story,
To this song of Hiawatha."

He is doubtless right in his position that in even savage bosoms there is a consciousness of God and a flickering spasmodic yearning for God; but he is over-confident if he means to teach that every such untaught savage will find God. How can they hear without a preacher? How can they understand except some man interpret to them the unknown God whom they have perchance touched?

So, whether we consult the untaught savage, the heathen philosopher, the Jewish prophet, the Christian apostle, or the poet of ancient or modern times, we find the need of a qualified and authorized religious teacher universally recognized and the coming of such a teacher universally desired.

A second evidence that the pastoral office has its basis in nature is found in a universal custom of mankind. Wherever man is, religion is. Wherever religion is we find the officers of religion. The facts of history justify Hoppin in saying, "Wherever man is or has been found something essentially corresponding to the office of Christian

pastor or permanent religious teacher has in fact been also found to exist." Every religion has had its priest. It is true that many of the religious dignitaries have been cringing sycophants, selfish parasites, who made religion a vehicle of fraud, graft, impurity and cruelty. But while these priestly absurdities and immoralities would tend to invalidate the religion they taught, they establish our proposition that there is in man's nature an unquenchable desire for a religious teacher. But for this instinct for a spiritual guide the heathen peoples would repudiate their absurd and unworthy religious functionaries. Their mimetic dances, their mystery games, their wild incantations, their furious bodily exercises, their absurdly artificial character-testing ordeals, their licentious orgies, their human sacrifices, all in the name of religion are unthinkable to one accustomed to the lofty simplicity of Hebrew prophet or Jewish priest or Christian pastor, but alike with prophet, priest and pastor they furnish the proof that man universally desires and feels the need of a religious teacher and that the pastoral office so far from being superficial and arbitrary has its roots in man's essential nature.

A still further reason for maintaining that the office is founded in nature is the instinctive shepherd heart. We all know men who seem to have been like Paul, separated from birth to the pastoral office. By nature, gifts, qualifications, tempera-

mental and intellectual tendencies, certain men seem foreshadowed to this office. The Latins had a proverb: *poeta nascitur non fit* (The poet is born, not made). Substitute "preacher" for "poet" and you have stated a deeper, more essential truth. We all know men both in history and in the limited sphere of our personal acquaintance who were evidently born with the preacher's heart and the preacher's hand and the preacher's habit. In this work they are happy and successful, but you could no more train them into the happy and successful pursuit of any other calling than you could train a fig into a thistle.

Some men are so imbued with the spirit of self-sacrifice, so endued with the power of human sympathy, so saturated with moral earnestness, so dauntlessly determined to know and teach the truth, so exquisitely spiritual in their trend of mind and so delicately discriminating in both conception and statement of religious truth that if there were no office of the ministry we would feel the necessity of creating it that such men might have a place where they could function and where their gifts could be exercised to the greatest good of society.

In concluding the story of his conversion from infidelity, B. H. Carroll said, "I knew then as well as I know now that I would preach, that it would be my life-work, that I would have no other work." Will you try to imagine certain men having any other business than that of gospel preacher? Try

it on Origen, Chrysostom, Athanasius, Ambrose. Try it on Wyclif, Luther, Calvin, John Knox. Try it on Schleiermacher, John Wesley, Christmas Evans, Jonathan Edwards. Try it on Spurgeon, Moody, Beecher, Phillips Brooks. Or, to come to living men, select a group of the spiritual leaders within your own acquaintance and try it on any of them. Imagine Bishop Candler a contented, carefree commercial traveller. Imagine William Anderson the pleased and prosperous president of a bank in Dallas. Imagine G. W. Truett the successful manager of a Texas railroad. Imagine E. Y. Mullins the proud proprietor of a department store in Louisville. These men have the ability to fill these secular places nobly. All these are in themselves honourable callings, but these men are so evidently set apart by a divine edict for the work of preaching that we would count them degraded in entering even the noblest secular calling.

Or if you are a preacher, imagine yourself out of the Gospel Ministry and giving your time and energy to some worthy commercial calling. If, as you imagine it, such a change would bring you no especial embarrassment and no sense of incongruity and no feeling of shame, you will never make the right sort of preacher. It proves that you are lacking in those delicate, undefined, indefinable, intangible temperamental qualities so essential to the ideal gospel minister. I would not say what Spurgeon is reported (perhaps falsely) to have said,

that a man ought not to enter the ministry if he can stay out of it, but I will say that if a man finds himself happy or satisfied or even unembarrassed in any other calling he has no proper place in the ministry.

Having said this, we must admit with sadness that there are ministers (many of them alas, alas) whose entrance upon a secular calling would elicit neither surprise nor comment nor regret. They are secular in their thinking, worldly in their ideals, carnal in their methods. In their conduct and conversation they reveal none of those marks of separateness that characterize the God-made and God-called preacher. Paul believed that the preacher was a man separated and consecrated to the work of preaching the gospel. His life program was "this one thing I do." Gloriously he lived that program. The preachers of the first church set a worthy example to all their successors when they not only desired but demanded that they be relieved of secular entanglements though of the noblest and most altruistic kind, that they might "continue steadfast in prayer and in the ministry of the word" (Acts 6: 4).

For this work of pastor God has peculiarly qualified certain men. If there is to be no such office it is not easily understood why these men have had bestowed upon them the intellectual, temperamental and spiritual gifts peculiarly and specifically qualifying them for such an office.

Here is an engineer about to start his engine on its long journey with its trainload of passengers. He sees a nut fall from his engine. Taking it up he sees that it was made to fit a bolt of a certain size. Knowing that the machinist would not have made it and put it in the engine unless he had also made a bolt it would fit, he delays his train till he finds that bolt. The nut made to fit a bolt argues the existence of that bolt. So a man specifically qualified of God to fill an office implies the divine purpose that there should be such an office. The preacher with the God-given pastor heart and the instinctive desire for the pastoral office furnishes good evidence that God decreed and established that office.

Now the foregoing leads to some inevitable practical conclusion to which we may well give a little serious reflection.

1. If the pastoral office is thus imbedded in the very nature of things every man who feels himself called to this fundamental task ought to enter it with the deepest sense of reverence for the office. To such a man the ministry is not a calling of such superficial nature that it can be taken up and laid down as a matter of personal choice or individual convenience. To such a man it is not a task of such secondary importance that it may be pursued in a half-hearted slip-shod perfunctory way. To such a man the ministry is not a life of slavish humdrum and ordinary commonplace drudgery,

but a life so replete with the highest and best that it stirs every romantic instinct and appeals to every chivalrous impulse, calling into activity everything in his nature that is best and noblest. He enters it with Paul's compelling sense of—"Woe is me if I preach not the gospel"; and he continues in it with Paul's exalted purpose—"I magnify mine office"; and he labours in it with Paul's undivided consecration—"This one thing I do"; and he prosecutes it with Paul's sacrificial self-forgetful willingness to—"gladly spend and be spent" in meeting its lofty demands; and he dedicates to it a clean holy life, saying with Paul (2 Cor. 6: 3–10):

"Giving no offence in anything, that the ministry be not blamed: But in all things approving ourselves as the ministers of God in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distress, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labours, in watchings, in fastings; By pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, By the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, By honour and dishonour, by evil report and good report: as deceivers, and yet true; As unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and, behold, we live; as chastened, and not killed; As sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things."

2. If this office is thus embedded in the nature

of things, it demands that churches give these men the opportunity of using their gifts. If there is any truth in the talk about a growing shortage of men entering the ministry and increasing tendency for those who are in to drop out and enter other more or less altruistic callings, may it not be at least partially due to the fact that the churches are so niggardly in their giving that they do not afford a support that would make it possible for a man to give himself with an undivided heart to the discharge of his duties as a preacher. Nearly all rural churches in the South are either Methodist or Baptist. When we consider the fact that eighteen out of every twenty rural Baptist churches and fifteen out of every seventeen rural Methodist churches in the South have only once a month preaching, and that practically all these are supplied by absentee pastors, and that the very large majority of these pastors are forced to give more than half their time to secular callings in order to live, how can we expect anything else than that the preacher shall be dehearted of his power and the ministry as a life's calling deflowered of its charm? If there is that in human nature that calls for the ministrations of the spiritual teacher then human nature must not be too parsimonious to so maintain this spiritual teacher that he may give himself wholly to the altruistic exercise of his shepherd gifts. A fourth-time church with its absentee pastor and with the doors of its meeting house

closed 90 per cent. of the time, can contribute very little to the community, and certainly affords a very slight challenge to the chivalrous devotion of a red-blooded man to become its pastor. If these men favoured with the gift of the shepherd-heart are to do their best for humanity's instinctive call for spiritual leaders they must not be handicapped by the burden of " much serving " in other spheres —and the churches must afford them equipment and opportunity to have an effectual hand in moulding the spiritual life of the people.

The lamented Sylvester Horne spoke a great truth when he said: " The preacher who is the messenger of God is the real master of society, not elected by society to be its ruler but elect of God to form its ideals and through them to guide and rule its life. Show me the man who in the midst of a community however secularized in its manners can compel it to think with him, can kindle its enthusiasm, revive its faith, cleanse its passions, purify its ambitions and give stedfastness to its will, and I will show you the real matter of society, no matter what party may nominally hold the reins of government, no matter what figure-head may occupy the nominal place of authority."

If such is the preacher's lofty prerogative what a pity to shackle him with lack of opportunity or lack of equipment, and what a tragedy if having such opportunity and equipment he is too petty and frivolous and short-sighted to utilize them.

II

THE TITLES OF THE OFFICE

"I was appointed a preacher, apostle, teacher."
—1 Timothy 2: 7.

SHAKESPEARE was right in saying that a rose by any other name would smell as sweet. But he was wrong if he held, as the context seems to imply, that there is nothing in a name. Often have we seen a man handicapped through life by the name his parents gave him or by the nickname given him by his companions. The character and standing of the preacher in any given age will be at least suggested by the names or titles given him by his contemporaries. It is an interesting fact that every title applied to the preacher whether scriptural or vernacular implies, when its etymology is traced, the highest respect for him and his office. Let us now give attention to some of these titles. We study them not primarily for the sake of information about the titles themselves, but because the titles of the office will throw much light on the nature and duties of the office.

I. Some Titles not Found in Scripture

1. *Clergyman.* The word is derived from the

Latin, *Clericus* (a priest). The Latin word is a transliteration of the Greek word, κληρικός (*Clericos*), which has the same meaning. The Greek word comes from κλῆρος (*cleros*) which means a lot or something chosen by lot. Its being applied to the pastoral office arose no doubt from the primitive custom of choosing church officers by lot (Acts 1: 26). As a specific title the word clergyman, though more frequent in England, is rarely used in this country except among Episcopalians, or their superficial imitators. The generic word clergy is quite generally used when it is desired to distinguish preachers as a class from the so-called laity.

Let us turn aside here to discuss for a moment the expression "Benefit of Clergy." The phrase furnishes an illustration of the growth of words. It is by many supposed to mean that in England a certain class of criminals were put to death, being denied the spiritual ministrations of a clergyman. But not so. It originally referred to the privilege claimed by the Mediæval Church of having its clergy exempt from trial before civil courts. Blackstone says: "The ancient usage was for the bishop to demand his clerics to be tried in the bishop's instead of the king's court." In 1330 by an edict of Edward III the exemption was extended to all who could read. The civil courts could not punish the crime of any man who like a clergyman could read. The pleasing feature as it relates to this

study is that it shows the clergy and the class who could read were considered practically identical. It emphasizes also the instinctive tribute men pay to education—putting it on the same plane with religion. Clergy and intelligence were words that represented ideas used almost interchangeably.

2. *Rector.* The word is derived from the Latin *regere* (to lead straight, to rule). Etymologically it implies three things expected of the preacher. (1) He must be a man qualified to lead. (2) He must be a straightforward man. (3) He must be a man clothed with authority. The word indicates the high regard in which their religious teachers are held by the people. The title is still in common use, limited however to the Church of England and in this country to the Episcopalians, and it is sometimes applied by the Catholics to the parish priest. They more often, however, apply it to the superior (head) of a college or seminary and it has often been so used by those not Catholics. The word "regent" so often used to indicate the controlling authority of a College or University has the same Latin origin as "rector." For a long time the President of Yale College was called "Rector" instead of "President." Thus again we see the official representative of religion vitally connected with education. How superficial the sceptic's sneer that the ministers of the Christian religion have retarded and opposed higher education. Taken as a class they have been in every

country its patrons. Along the trail of the ages their contribution to every branch of higher education has far surpassed that of any other calling—perhaps that of all other callings.

3. *Parson.* Why should a preacher object to being called parson? It is the old English way of saying "person." They pronounced person "parson" just as they pronounced clerk "clark." When they spoke of the minister as "the parson" they designated him the preëminent individual in the community. It is true the word has degenerated by use, as so many words do, and is now often spoken by way of disparagement. It is also admitted that words mean what they mean and not what they used to mean. But if "some lewd fellow of the baser sort" thinks to discount you, my sensitive young brother, by calling you "parson," recoup yourself by remembering the word's noble etymology, and mollify your lacerated epidermis with the reflection that in applying to you the title that designates you the chief person in the community, the churl spoke more wisely than he knew.

4. *Reverend.* The word comes from the Latin *revereri* (to fear). It occurs one time in our English Bible (Ps. 111: 9) and is there applied to God. For this reason and perhaps others, there are many who object to it as a title applied to men. If our use of it implies the etymological meaning it hardly embodies the New Testament notion of the pastoral office. Spurgeon seems to have ob-

jected to the title not so much on etymological nor on scriptural grounds as on general principles. When asked by one of his students as to the use of this title he is reported to have said, "It depends on who he is. If he is a very small mite of a man whom no one would see except with a microscope, call him Reverend. If he is anybody that *is* anybody, you need not." But the man who objects to being called "parson" should not object to being called "Reverend" for he said then, "Words mean what they mean and not what they used to mean." If the word once carried the idea of awe and cringing fear that idea when it is used as a ministerial title is no longer in it. As now used among us the word simply means that the man to whom it is applied is a preacher. In every-day use it means that; just that; nothing more, nothing less. There are other titles that some of us prefer, but life is so full of real issues that we might well regard this one as negligible. Epithetiphobia is neither fatal nor dangerous, but it sometimes makes a patient a little uncomfortable and slightly disagreeable.

5. *Doctor.* Originally this was an academic title indicating that the bearer of it was sufficiently versed in a certain branch of knowledge to teach it. Now it is used to indicate that the possessor of it has taken the highest degree in a College, University or Seminary. The degree is often conferred when there is little learning and less merit.

It is growing more and more common to call all ministers "Doctor." Such people forget or never knew that "Doctor" is a scholar's and not a preacher's title. If a preacher bears the title it is not because he is a preacher, but because he is, or is supposed to be, a scholar. Usually the scholar who wears the title "Doctor of Divinity" is a preacher. But the degree is occasionally conferred upon men who are not preachers. So that "D. D." does not necessarily imply a preacher. There are noble brothers who hold that when Jesus said, "Be not ye called Rabbi" (Matt. 3: 8), He was specifically forbidding the degree of Doctor of Divinity. The brother who holds that view should burn his Master's diploma whether in theology or arts, for the tenth verse forbids us to be called master. This brother should never say "Father Buckner" again, nor allow the little orphans to say it. He should also call his paternal ancestor "Dad" or "the old man," for the ninth verse forbids us to call any man on the earth father. See the folly of "mere verbal and literal interpretation." In his commentary on Matthew, Dr. Broadus has a sane word on this question. "What our Lord prohibits," he says, "is desire for the distinction involved in being recognized as a religious teacher. A man who shows great desire 'to be invited into the pulpit' or otherwise publicly treated as a minister is exactly violating this command. The title of Doctor of Divinity is often

so conferred, so sought, so borne and so declined as to come under this head, but it is the spirit involved rather than the phrase that should be condemned." Title fever is a very unaccountable and a very infectious disease. The germ is very prolific in Theological Seminary atmospheres. Perhaps the best remedy for it is a mixture in equal parts of religion and common sense. It is said of the late Mrs. J. B. Gambrell that when her distinguished husband received this degree, she told him: "The degree of Doctor of Divinity is like the curl in a pig's tail—somewhat ornamental, but it does not add anything to the weight of the pig." I would rather be a mouse-trap that could do the business than a mogul engine that could not pull. It is the man, my brothers,—what he is and what he can do that counts, and not the source and number of his degrees.

> "The rank is but the guinea's stamp
> The man's the gold for a' that."

But let us turn now to discuss

II. Some Titles Found in Scripture

1. *Apostle.* The Greek noun is ἀπόστολος (*apostolos*) from the verb ἀποστέλλω (*apostello*) (to send forth). The word carries with it the idea of one thoroughly prepared and definitely authorized to go on a special mission. Usage in classic

Greek as well as the example of our Saviour in training and sending out the twelve justifies the idea that the word means more than simply to send off, but implies thorough preparation and a definitely outlined mission, illustrated by a passage in classic Greek in which *apostolos* is used for "a commander of a fleet ready to sail."

There is evidently no such office now as the New Testament apostle. The qualifications of an apostle furnish sufficient proof of this proposition. An apostle was one who had (1) seen Jesus, who had (2) "companied with" Him and His disciples during His ministry and had (3) received from Him supernatural gifts of miracles and inspiration. This effectually disposes of the Romish fiction of Apostolic succession which means that the power and authority of the Apostles have been directly transmitted in unbroken succession from man to man in every generation since Christ. According to this view every parish priest and every village rector has received his official power and authority through a direct unbroken chain of apostolic predecessors. Good intelligent men teach and doubtless sincerely believe that figment. How such twaddle can "get by" in the twentieth century some of us cannot imagine. Hoppin makes some sober and illuminating remarks on the subject: "The fallacy of the theory, we think, is in making the succession individual instead of general. The fact of a body of Christian ministers

continually existing from the time of the Apostles to the present day or of the Church always having and recognizing its own ministers who in an important sense derive their succession from the apostles by possessing their spirit and teaching the truth they taught—this is an undeniable fact; but that any one minister of the series—let him be called "bishop" or simple "pastor"—has had an unbroken descent of successive ordinations from the Apostles—this is too broad an assertion. It cannot be sustained and this is all—this assumption—that there is in apostolic succession."

The true preacher finds his authority and his encouragement in a glowing present call of God and not in a shadowy doubtful succession of men. But having denied the doctrine of a chronological and mechanical succession, we not only gladly admit but earnestly maintain that there is a very genuine sense in which every true preacher is a successor to the apostles. The preacher succeeds the apostle because he is doing essentially the same work, in answer to the same divine call and under practically the same divine instructions. While not claiming to be formal successors to the apostolic office or apostolic authority we are taught to make their official conduct an example for our own. Paul called the Ephesian elders together (Acts 20) and in the course of a rather long address said to them: "In all things I gave you an example." Blessed is that modern preacher who though re-

jecting apostolic succession models his life after apostolic example.

2. *Prophet.* Certain persons in the New Testament record seem to have been especially inspired to teach and interpret divine truth and even to foretell events. Revealing truth and foretelling the future constituted the striking characteristic duties of the Old Testament prophet. The inspired interpretation to a heathen mind of a truth already revealed seems to have been the chief work of the New Testament prophet. We have, however (Acts 11: 28), evidence that these New Testament prophets had also supernatural knowledge of the future. Because of limited New Testament data it is difficult to say whether the title "prophet" implied a distinct order or office in the Church or referred to a special gift conferred upon and exercised by individuals regardless of official position. The latter alternative seems to have the better of the argument. The main Scripture passages bearing upon the subject are Matthew 10: 41; 23: 34; Luke 11: 49; Acts 11: 27; Acts 13: 1; Acts 15:32; 1 Corinthians 12: 28–29; Ephesians 2: 20; 3: 5; 4: 11; Revelation 18: 20; 22: 6–9. Comparing these with post-apostolic Christianity it is safe to assume that whether an office or a gift it passed away with the apostolic period. Yet when one remembers history he dares not speak too dogmatically on this point. Would one write himself down a hopeless heretic if he regarded as super-

naturally enlightened prophetic interpreters of revealed but forgotten truth such men as Athanasius, Luther, Calvin, Bunyan, Carey, and Carroll? Or what true preacher has not at times experienced an afflatus giving to his ministry spiritual power and insight not his own? But such views must be entertained cautiously, if at all, lest they lead to fanaticism. Because many false prophets are gone out into the world it is well to obey the Scripture injunction to prove the spirits before trusting them too far. One acid test is the candidate's own claim. The man who lays loudest claim to this divine afflatus is apt to have the least of it.

3. *Evangelist.* The word comes from the Greek εὐαγγελιστης (*euaggelistes*) and means a bringer of good tidings. Touching its New Testament signification three views are advanced. (1) It was like the Apostolate, a distinct office, but like it passed away with the closing of the apostolic period—there being no necessity for such an office after Christianity had been inaugurated. (2) It was a distinct office intended to be permanent in the Churches. (3) It was not a distinct office in any sense but was a gift which might be bestowed upon individuals and exercised by them independent of official position. The word occurs in the Scriptures only three times. (1) Where reference is made (Acts 21: 8) to "the house of Philip the evangelist who was one of the seven." (2) Where Paul charges Timothy (2 Tim. 4: 5) to "do the

work of an evangelist." (3) Where some of the spiritual functionaries are enumerated, "And he gave some to be apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists and some pastors and teachers" (Eph. 4: 11). The last reference would seem to imply that it was a separate office of lower rank than apostle and prophet but higher than pastor and teacher. But taking the passage in connection with the other two my own mind is impelled to the conclusion that the New Testament evangelist was a man upon whom special gifts were bestowed as it pleased the Spirit but that the exercise of these gifts did not imply a distinct office. Evangelism was and is a glorious gift to be used and not a separate office to be filled. This position is taken with some hesitancy in view of the fact that practically all the authorities hold either that it is a distinct office still in force or that it was a distinct office but abolished after the inauguration of Christianity. The view that it was and is a spiritual gift and not a distinct church office is based on the following facts: (1) Philip held the office of deacon but was called an evangelist. (2) Timothy held the office of bishop or elder but was told to do the work of an evangelist—exercise the bishop's office in the evangelistic spirit. (3) Paul held the office of apostle, yet he was a typical evangelist and referred to himself more than a score of times as doing the work of an evangelist. (4) In Paul's letters to Timothy and Titus he gives in detail the

qualification for the bishop-elder office and also for the office of deacon, but gives none for the office of evangelist. (5) We find New Testament record of men being ordained to the office of deacon (Acts 6: 3) and to the office of elder (Titus 1: 5) but no record of their being ordained to the office of evangelist. (6) In church history we find the story of evangelism clearly set out but no reference to the evangelist as a distinct officer in the church.

Saying that the evangelist is not now and never was a distinct officer in the church does not discount evangelism nor unfrock the evangelist. The one point here insisted upon is that there are just two officers in a New Testament Church—the bishop (elder, pastor, teacher), and the deacon. When God comes to bestow the evangelistic gift it may please Him to choose a man from either of these offices or He may make His choice from the non-official ranks. Some of the greatest evangelists in history have been men holding no official position in the Church. It goes without saying, however, that the evangelistic gift is usually found in one who is officially a preacher or who because of his marked possession of this gift will soon become a preacher.

Much time has been foolishly wasted trying to determine which is more important in the Kingdom—the evangelistic gift or the pastor-teacher gift. One may as well discuss which is more im-

portant in a house—foundation or walls. There never was a true pastor who did not have an evangelistic heart and there never was an ideal evangelist who did not have a shepherd's heart. In one man one quality will be found preëminent, in another the other; but in every true preacher both elements will be found. In some men the evangelistic element is so predominant that they ought to give themselves wholly to that work. With some men the pastoral element is so predominant that the pastorate is evidently their life's work. With a few rare and radiant souls the evangelistic and the pastoral element are so evenly balanced that they are as much at home in one as in the other. These are the noble men who in our modern parlance are called pastor-evangelists. These are the ideal preachers. Such were Paul and Timothy. To be such is the noblest ambition any preacher can indulge.

4. *Teacher.* The Greek word is διδασκαλος (*didaskalos*). It occurs fifty-seven times in the New Testament. It is applied to Jesus thirty-eight times and when thus used is always translated master except in the mouth of Nicodemus where it is translated teacher. In 2 Timothy 1: 11, Paul applies it to himself. Besides these it three times refers to the office of the New Testament preacher,—Acts 13: 1; 1 Corinthians 12: 28–29; and Ephesians 4: 11. The ministerial function implied in this word is close akin to that contained

in pastor—not synonymous with it but complementary to it. In Ephesians 4: 11, the words pastor and teacher refer to the same officer. A literal translation of the verse would be, "And he gave indeed the apostles, and the prophets, and the evangelists, and the pastors and teachers." There are two reasons for believing that "apostle" and "prophet" and "evangelist" refer to different persons, while "pastor" and "teacher" refer to the same person. (1) The omission of the article before "teachers," and its use before all the other titles. If one should say, "they sold the farm and the store and the mill and the house and lot," he would imply an identity between "house" and "lot" not predicated of the others. (2) The word translated "and" between "pastor" and "teacher" is και (*kai*) the word always used to connect words similar or identical in meaning, whereas the word used between the other titles is the adversative particle δε (*de*) indicating dissimilarity.

5. *Elder.* The Greek word is πρεσβυτερος (*presbuteros*). In its primary sense it referred to a person of advanced age but because filling a high office carried with it like old age the idea of honour and dignity the word came to apply to persons in high official position—among the Jews, members of the Sanhedrin,—in civil government, ambassadors, and in the New Testament, leaders of the churches. The word occurs about sixty-five times

in the New Testament, referring about fifteen times to the pastoral office. It implies the dignity of this office and gravity on the part of the man who fills it. When Paul enjoined Timothy, "Let no man despise thy youth" (1 Tim. 4: 12), he was begging Timothy to be guilty of no youthful frivolity inconsistent with the dignity of his high office. When he said, "Flee also youthful lusts (pleasures)" he was suggesting that there are youthful pleasures and amusements permissible perhaps to other young people which the young preacher must forego. Young preachers in my acquaintance have earned for themselves the contempt of thoughtful people because they forgot this advice of Paul. What they did was not sinful—it was just silly—but it cost them their ministerial standing in the community. The young preacher has often hurtfully disregarded this Pauline injunction by innocent attention to the young women in the congregation. Timothy should be scrupulously gallant to every woman in his church but not the gallant of any. By all means the pastor should have a hand on and in the amusements of his young people but unless he is careful of manner and motive the people will despise him for it. Certainly there is no superstitious sanctimoniousness about the preacher that detaches, separates, and isolates him from any other saved man. But in the last analysis the preacher's office essentially differentiates him from

others—in his own eyes, in the eyes of the people and in the eyes of God. Yes, the Church is a democracy in which all men are free and equal, but the preacher because of his office is under a noble constraint that does not impel others. Dancing for joy before the Lord was a common and in itself a commendable thing among the Jews, but when King David laid aside his royal raiment and joined the people in this harmless, semi-religious exercise we are told that his wife "Michal the daughter of Saul looked out at the window and saw King David dancing and playing and she despised him in her heart."

My young preacher brother will claim that he has the same human instincts that other redeemed young people have and has the same right to gratify them. Abstractly considered he is right about it. He has the law on his side, and yet, "All things are lawful but not all things are expedient; all things are lawful but not all things edify. Let no man seek his own but each his neighbour's good." No man has a right to do all he has a right to do. James Ward says: "Without this inter-subjective intercourse mankind remains a herd; with it they become a society." The right-minded young preacher will wear no badge of separateness and assume no air of aloofness but will be consciously clothed with the unseen ermine of his office and thereby restrained from the thing that is frivolous and unseemly. If the boy preacher feels

that there is an inconsistency in his being called "elder" let him remember that the title is based not on the age of the incumbent but on the dignity with which he is supposed to fill the office.

6. *Bishop.* The Greek word is ἐπίσκοπος (*episkopos*) and means an overseer. The commissioners sent by Athens to superintend her tributary states were called episkopoi. In the Septuagint, the oldest Greek version of the Old Testament, men filling certain important executive stations were called *episkopoi.* (Num. 4: 16; 31: 14; Ps. 109: 8; Isa. 60: 17.) Since one of the duties of the pastor of a New Testament church was that of overseeing and superintending its affairs it was quite natural that one of the titles of the officers should be *episkopos.* The Anglo-Saxon equivalent for the Greek word is *biscop*—(bishop) and it is always so translated in our English Bible (R. V.). It would seem desirable to insert here a brief statement of the views of leading denominations on this subject.

Broadly speaking, there are three views held. (1) The office of bishop is in direct unbroken apostolic succession and is divinely vested with apostolic power and superior authority. This view is held by Roman Catholics, Greek Catholics and the High Church element of both the Church of England and the Episcopal Church in this country. They all regard this doctrine as essential to the very existence of the Church. More than once the

Episcopalians of this country have thwarted their much advertised desire for organic Christian union by insisting that this doctrine of the episcopacy as they hold it should be made the first plank in the platform.

(2) The office of bishop while superior to other ranks in the ministry is not by apostolic succession nor by scriptural authority exercised as a distinct office, but has come to be so exercised and recognized on the ground of expediency. They regard the "episcopate as desirable and necessary for the well-being of the Church but in no sense indispensable to its existence." This view is held by the Low Church element in the Church of England and in the Episcopal Church, by Methodists, Moravians, Lutherans and some other small congregations.

(3) There is no such distinct office, but the word bishop, along with presbyter, pastor and teacher is used to designate any man set apart formally to the gospel ministry. This view is held by Baptists, Congregationalists, Disciples, Presbyterians and others. It is not meant that the separate groups classified under (1), (2), and (3), hold exactly the same views. In fact they do not. But it is believed that the individual congregations in each group are near enough alike to justify the classification proposed.

III

THE TITLES OF THE OFFICE (*Continued*)

"Tend my sheep."—JOHN 21: 16.

LET us give this entire chapter to the discussion of the preacher's preëminent title. *Shepherd.* The Greek word is ποιμήν (*poimen*). It is also translated by the synonymous word "pastor." Shepherd is the Anglo-Saxon and pastor the Latin derivative for the same idea. The word is used seventeen times in the New Testament. Seven times it is applied to our Lord and once (Eph. 4: 11) to the preacher. In this case it is translated pastor. In all others it is translated shepherd.

In the first chapter of his helpful little book, "The Minister as Shepherd," Dr. C. E. Jefferson says: "Of all the titles that have been minted for the envoys of the Son of God that of shepherd is the most popular and the most beautiful and the most ample." He will have no trouble in getting a practically unanimous verdict that the word "shepherd" is the most beautiful and the most ample title for the gospel minister; but if by "most popular" he means most commonly used, he is wide of the mark. If, however, with his Anglo-

Saxon "Shepherd" he will combine its Latin synonym "pastor" his statement will pass unchallenged. The pity of it is that with the usual process of linguistic degeneration the word pastor has in a very large measure lost the shepherd idea. Most of those who now use the word "pastor" do not have his shepherd quality in mind. If Mr. Jefferson had chosen as the title of his book "The Pastor as Shepherd" probably few would have noticed that he was trying to limit the meaning of one word by the use of another that is etymologically its exact synonym. The man who will restore to the word "pastor" its proper shepherd meaning will be a genuine benefactor. That we may contribute our mite to this devoutly wished consummation let us emphasize some of the essential pastoral qualifications implied in calling the preacher a shepherd. In His last conversation with Peter (John 21: 15–17) Jesus makes some very discriminating suggestions on the duties of a shepherd.

(1) *Oversight.* In the sixteenth verse He says "tend my sheep." It would do no violence to the Greek word if we translated it "Shepherd my sheep" or if we might verbalize another noun, "pastor my sheep." The crying need of our churches is shepherds who will diligently tend the sheep. I am for the eloquent sermon, the packed auditorium, the modern Sunday school, the large collection. But beware, good as all these things

are there is in them a constant temptation to the pastor to exploit the sheep rather than to shepherd them. In your congregation are the sick and the wayward and the discouraged and the doubting and the vacillating. It is your God-appointed business to shepherd these sick sheep. You have the shepherd's heart and the impulse of that noble heart is to do this very thing. Your danger is that you will allow some other supposed duty to sidetrack you from the main line.

In your congregation are those who are being assailed by some subtle heresy. The wolf of false doctrine is prowling stealthily and relentlessly in the trail of one of your sheep. What are you going to do about it? Are you going to prepare a great sermon on that heresy and preach it some Sunday morning when perhaps the one member affected is not present, serving probably no other purpose than to advertise the heresy among those who know not of it and scatter its infection throughout the entire community. Why doctor the whole flock when only one sheep is sick? To give medicine to a man who does not need it is sometimes as serious in its results as not to give it to one who does. Or there is one in your congregation who is being besieged by an insidious temptation. What are you going to do about it? Are you going to prepare a great sermon on that peculiar temptation and fire it at the heads of people to whom it does not apply and to whom it is prac-

tically without meaning? That is the easiest way, but it will perhaps do no good and may and doubtless will do harm.

To speak in concrete terms—it is reported to you that a young girl in your community has been dancing. There are two ways to deal with the case. One is to preach on it. In all probability you will say some rash thing that will alienate the affectionate confidence of your young people and discount your wisdom in the minds of many who are older. The young girl herself, goaded with the sense of being "preached at" before the whole congregation, boils over with resentment, says she will dance when she pleases and asks that her name be stricken from the church roll. Many people will sympathize with her; it is talked around; people take sides and the first thing you know, you have a schism in your church and have not stopped the dancing. The other way to deal with it is to go some afternoon in the spirit and with the heart of a shepherd to the young girl's home and in the presence of her mother go over the matter with her tenderly and affectionately. Show her that while the act of dancing may not seem wrong to her that she ought to be willing to give it up because it is offensive to many of the best members of the church and will cripple her own usefulness as a Christian. If this is done with the brother-heart and the shepherd-spirit the young girl will in all probability give up dancing and will from

that day become your unflinching friend and unwavering champion.

A sheep of yours is gradually and perhaps unconsciously grazing toward the marsh or the precipice or the beast-infested wilderness. All the other sheep are quietly ruminating in the shade. Are you going to arouse the whole flock and chase them all over the prairie because one sheep is going astray? When the shepherd in Luke 15 discovered that one sheep had gone astray, he left the ninety and nine and went forth in quiet personal effort to restore the straying sheep. He found his straying sheep first and then pulled off his sensation. Too many of us pull off our sensation, preach our big sermon first, and do not find the stray sheep at all.

You are pastor of this church, my brother. What are you here for? To make a sermon? To draw a crowd? To build a Sunday school? To raise a collection? Yes, incidentally. As a means to an end—yes. But your danger is that you shall dishonour these splendid ministerial functions by making them an end and not a means. In the same verse where Paul told Timothy to "preach the word," he also commanded him to "reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and teaching." If Paul in his address to the Ephesian elders emphasized his public preaching, he also in the same sentence emphasized his tearful personal teaching from home to home. In emphasizing the

duty of personal individual watch-care of the flock I am not meaning to decry the preacher's public functions. The fact that a man is at this moment facing east does not compel him to deny the charm of a sunset. Many preachers talk about choosing between being a good pastor and a good preacher just as if one precluded the other. If a man does not give his people personal pastoral attention his preaching may be logical and forceful and scriptural, but it will have a far-away, metallic ring. Such preaching is some better than a phonograph but not much. On the other hand if a man's preaching is weak, flabby, and uninteresting, his personal ministrations soon become " stale, flat and unprofitable." The preacher who enlightens my head or mellows my heart with his strong sermon on Sunday, will be a respected, coveted and profitable visitor in my home during the week. And the preacher whose pastoral visit during the week comforted and heartened and steadied me left a soil in a high state of preparation for his Sunday's message. Happy is the preacher whose heart responds to Peter's glowing exhortation to the elders (1 Pet. 5: 2–4): " Tend (shepherd) the flock of God which is among you, exercising the oversight, not by constraint but willingly according to the word of God; nor yet for filthy lucre but of a ready mind, neither as lording it over the charge allotted to you but making yourselves examples to the flock. And when the chief shepherd shall be

manifested ye shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away."

(2) Another duty of the shepherd suggested by this same conversation between Peter and his Lord is that he shall *feed the sheep* (John 21: 15–17).

It is told of a farmer that his favourite horse began to lose flesh, grew weak and seemed about to die. He called in his neighbours. They tried all the remedies known to their limited veterinary pharmacopœia, but like the woman in the Bible, the victim of many doctors, he grew nothing better but worse. At last a wise old farmer, "a Daniel come to judgment," looked the horse over carefully and said: "Suppose you try feeding him." They tried it and the horse recovered. This fable teaches that many times the preacher finds his church in a weak and spiritless condition. It gets on his conscience—or more accurately speaking perhaps—on his nerves. With almost frantic zeal he tries all the remedies proposed by theological and sociological experts. One after another he calls in the peripatetic evangelist, the Sunday-school specialist, the got-rich-quick layman with his lectures on stewardship—*et cetera—et id omne-genus* —and watches in vain for signs of spiritual improvement. At last he discovers—before it dies let us hope—that what the church needs is feeding. Paul in his address to the Ephesian elders (Acts 20: 28) said: "*Feed* the church of the Lord which he hath purchased with his own blood." Surely

this is a crowning duty of the pastor. Whatever he does or whatever he fails to do he must not starve the flock. We have preachers who are counted experts in various lines of ministerial activity. Some noble, some ignoble. But they seem sadly indifferent to the matter of feeding the flock. In fact they think, or seem to think, they have found something better for the sheep than feeding them. Shall we enumerate a few of these presumptuous pulpiteers?

(*a*) *The hullabaloo preacher.* If the sheep are quietly browsing on the meadow or peacefully chewing the cud in the shade this shepherd is of all men most miserable. In his program there is no time and no place for sheep to graze or ruminate. Let us not misunderstand each other here. There is no intention to belittle Christian activity or to depreciate the pastor who is skillful in eliciting it. Neither is there any purpose to afford comfort to the pastor who allows his church to waste and wither through sheer idleness. But I do wish to emphasize the fact that the sheep that is not fed and given time to ruminate its food will not because it cannot be active long. You may scare it up and with one kind of artificial stimulant or another keep it on the run for a time, but sooner or later it fags and falls. Pastor Truett tells of the brother preacher who was always on the jump—first to post then to pillar. He would hurry uptown, into a store, strike off a hasty letter, rush

down to the train to mail it—thus on one pretext or another meeting every passenger train during the day. One day in the presence of his deacons lamenting the barrenness of his ministry he wrung his hands and said: "What more can I do? I have done all I know. Can you brethren suggest anything else I can do?" One of the deacons quietly and perhaps sarcastically said: "Suppose you try meeting the freight trains, too." Many among our preachers and many among our flocks need, sadly need, an awakening of zeal. But many also need to learn the value of feeding time and to form the feeding habit. Some of us need to learn what Jewett meant when he said: "The quality of human life doth not consist in bustle or activity but in stillness," or what Lowell meant when he said: "God never takes needless trouble. It is only foolish little men that are fond of fusses." Or better still let us learn what Isaiah (30: 15–17) meant when he represented God as saying to the pursued and harassed sheep of His flock: "In returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and confidence shall be your strength. And ye would not, but ye said 'No, for we will flee upon horses,' therefore shall ye flee, and 'We will ride upon the swift,' therefore shall they that pursue you be swift . . . till ye be left as a pole upon the top of a mountain." What a striking picture of the desolation sure to follow the effort to substitute speed for the restful, quiet feeding time.

(*b*) *The gum-shoe preacher.* Our former brother was never happy unless he "saw a great noise" and counted his work a failure if he could not keep everything in a stir. But our brother of the present paragraph finds his highest ideal of ministerial success in keeping everything smooth and quiet. Don't talk to him about feeding the sheep. He is so busy oiling machinery not necessary to a sheepfold that he has no time to prepare food or look for pasture. There is notorious absence of fellowship in the church. There is gross worldliness and sin on the part of its membership, its records are cumbered with the names of many who never attend its services and do not respond to its ordinances nor believe its doctrines, but with a "hist" and a "hush-sh" he discourages all reference to these things lest it bring disturbance into the church. Dr. B. H. Carroll was very deaf. His wife left the sleeping baby with him one day while she went shopping. Since the baby was asleep, he proceeded to immerse himself in his studies. His brother, J. M., passing along the street, heard the baby crying lustily and came in to see what was wrong. As he entered the good Doctor said: "Don't make a noise, Jimmie, or you will wake the baby." Being shown that the baby was already awake he stood helpless and said, "Jimmie, what are we to do with the poor little thing?" Seeing its bottle lying on the bed Jimmie put it to the baby's mouth and the turmoil ceased. This

story teaches that the gum-shoe method cannot permanently prevent nor effectually cure a church wrangle. The best preventive and the best remedy in the case of a church wrangle is to feed the flock. Even a pack of dogs will quit fighting if you put food before them. The right sort of church is not built by managerial skill—by diplomacy and engineering and wire-pulling and gum-shoeing and pussy-footing. The right sort of church is built by an open, frank, outright, thorough, impartial feeding of the people out of the Holy Scriptures—rightly dividing the Word of God.

Take this group of Scriptures: "a householder bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old" (Matt. 13: 52); "a word in due season how good it is"; "the law of Jehovah is perfect restoring the soul. The testimony of Jehovah is sure making wise the simple. The precepts of Jehovah are right rejoicing the heart. The commandment of Jehovah is pure enlightening the eyes." "Wherewith shall a young man cleanse his way? By taking heed thereto according to thy word." "And beginning from Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." "And they said one to another, Was not our heart burning within us while he spake to us in the way, while he opened to us the Scriptures!" "The word of his grace which is able to build you up." "Preach the word." These and scores of similar passages

show the value of God's word in the growing of a church. If a preacher once gets his people in the habit of yielding to a "thus saith the Lord" he will find church management greatly simplified. But if he proposes to keep the church pacified by administering antiscriptural or even extra-scriptural narcotics he is launching his ministerial boat into a "sea of trouble." The patient may lie quiet for a while under gum-shoe narcotics but when he comes out of his stupor he is always more or less delirious and always gives the doctor trouble. An open policy and an open Bible guarantee a sane and useful ministry.

(*c*) *The Buncombe County preacher.* Darlington tells us that the word "buncombe" originated near the close of the debate on the famous "Missouri question" in the Sixteenth Congress. It was then used by Felix Walker, a naive old mountaineer who resided at Waynesville in Haywood County, North Carolina, near the border of the adjacent county of Buncombe, which formed a part of his district. The old man rose to speak while the House was impatiently calling for the "question," and several members gathered round him begging him to desist. He persevered, however, declaring that the people of his district expected it and that he was "bound to make a speech for *Buncombe.*" The ingenuous old politician has his antitype in some of our pulpits. Mr. Barnum said the world loved to be humbugged. On that predi-

cate he built a princely fortune and achieved international fame. But a circus and a church are not identical. Methods that will build a circus will ultimately prove fatal to a church. The crass sensationalist, the purveyor of ecclesiastical humbug, will run well for a season but sooner or later—usually sooner—he will come to grief. The preacher puts a knife to his throat the day he consents to do spurious and superficial work under the veneer of genuine. History bristles with concrete evidence that every ecclesiastical humbug will be unmasked. Simon the sorcerer had his Philip. Elymas had his Paul. Tatzel had his Luther, and it is not treason to say that every ministerial hoax is doomed to withering exposure. God pity the flock when the shepherd ceases to supply natural and wholesome food but dopes the sheep with hurtful and artificial stimulants.

(*d*) *The sheep-shearing preacher.* He is the man of varying value who makes a specialty of money raising. Shearing the sheep is a duty and a very important duty of the shepherd. But if the shepherd makes shearing the sheep his preëminent thought and care he will find the wool growing lighter each succeeding season. The shepherd who gets the most wool is the one who loves his sheep and therefore takes the best care of them. What you get off a sheep's back will be measured by what you put into his mouth and not by the expert handling of shears. If a preacher makes

money raising the *summum bonum* of his ministry he has forfeited every other good thing to start with and will soon lose that. Such a man will get fine collections the first year but they will decrease with steady arithmetic retrogression. While the preacher who faithfully feeds his flock out of the wholesome storehouse of God's word and carefully shepherds them with a loving heart and a firm gentle hand will find that the wool grows heavier year by year. If you want to be a money raiser grow a great soul in your own breast and a great Christ-honouring spirit in your congregation. B. H. Carroll, George W. Truett and L. R. Scarborough have raised more money by direct personal appeal than any other three men known to me. Yet no one regards money-raising the chief handiwork of either. They are posited in the thought of the people as respectively, Bible teacher, Pastor, Evangelist. For either of them to project himself as a mere money-raiser would prove as fatal to his strength as Delilah to Samson. My young brother, don't fail to shear the sheep, but the heavy yield will follow faithful feeding. As a wool producer snapping the shears is a poor substitute for feeding the sheep.

(3) But a third New Testament mark of the shepherd is *anxiety for the sheep.* We are told (John 10: 12–13) that the hireling sees the sheep snatched and scattered but does not care—is not concerned. One of the most gracious things af-

firmed of God, the Chief Shepherd, is that He does care (1 Pet. 5: 7). Was it Madame de Staël who said, "Sympathy is your pain in my heart"? The pain in the heart of the humblest member of the flock is to the true pastor a pain in his own. The genuine preacher is in a general way touched with the infirmity of men but in a special sense and in a very different way he travails for those for whom God has made him responsible as a shepherd. The highest honour that can be conferred by men upon a fellow-man is to be the chosen pastor of a little flock of God's children. The lowest recreancy is to betray that trust or be indifferent to it. Once convince your congregation that you sincerely seriously labour for their welfare and you thereby cover a multitude of crudities and shortcomings. The church will patiently tolerate nearly anything if the preacher shows an unselfish shepherd's anxiety for their good. Once justify an interrogation after that essential item and from that day all your brilliant performances are to them sounding brass and clanging cymbal. A pastor without anxiety's unutterable travail over his flock is an abomination of desolation holding a position that he ought not. If a pastor never loses sleep over his flock he will soon lose sleep because he has none. The highest tribute that can be paid mortal man is to say that he has the shepherd's heart. The noblest quality of the shepherd's heart is its constant anxiety for the flock.

(4) A fourth essential to a good shepherd is *intimate personal relation with the sheep.* Jesus, the preëminent pastor, said: "I am the good shepherd (pastor). I know mine own and mine own know me." The more intimate the relation between the right sort of pastor and his people the more joy and profit that relation affords. There is a theory abroad that the pastor cannot afford to be on intimate terms with his people lest familiarity breed contempt. The answer is that it will depend on the character of the pastor. The prophet of Khorassan wore a veil to hide his monstrous face. But the pastor is not supposed to have moral deformities which he must cover under the veil of isolation. It was never necessary with Jesus nor with Paul nor with any true man. A sorcerer, a wizard, a magician, an astrologer, a spiritualistic medium and a fake preacher may all need to shroud themselves in mysterious isolation lest the fraud they seek to practice be exposed. But the gospel preacher with a genuine message and an honest heart and a straight life needs no such subterfuge. If he is a true man bearing a true story to the hearts of men, he not only has no need to fear his people but should diligently cultivate the most intimate touch with them. His hours of study and prayer should, of course, be faithfully guarded, but he should at the same time seek the most vital fellowship with the heart life of his people.

There are two classes of our preachers who are very largely denied this element of power. (*a*) *The city pastor.* His membership is so large that it is impossible for him to know them well enough to be a shepherd to them. All churches, but particularly city churches, need pastors more than they need preachers. When a church reaches a membership of more than five hundred it is too large for one shepherd. It either ought to send out a "swarm" to start another church or adopt the scripturally authorized plan of a plurality of pastors. A man can preach to a thousand people, but no one man can be pastor of a thousand people. It is delightful to find myself in accord with such an eminent and experienced city pastor as Dr. C. E. Jefferson, who says: "Every city church of a thousand ought to have a staff of pastors and each one ought to do the thing he can do the best. We ought to utilize in the ministry men of the most diverse endowments; we impoverish our church life by limiting the ministry practically to men of a single type. Nearly all our city churches are run on the old village plan; one man is supposed to do everything. No wonder they do not cope successfully with city problems." Most of our city churches are undertaking the impossible thing of doing their work through Sunday's pulpit and Sunday-school ministration. Dr. Jefferson continues: "What our city churches need more than all things else are pastors. A city church like a city hospital

or a city school is an expensive institution and laymen must be educated to pour their money into it with a generosity hitherto unknown. It is because Christian laymen as a rule do not know the value of pastoral service that most of our city churches are to-day fighting a losing battle."

(*b*) But the man who has the most pathetic struggle in seeking to be a pastor to his people is the "fourth-time" preacher—the preacher who gives one Sunday out of the month to each of four churches, usually widely separated. Whether a church is large or small, it is not in the power of man to be a pastor to it and spend only two days out of each month on the field. It is better than no pastoral service, but it is far less than the situation demands. If our village and open country churches are to measure up to their responsibilities and their possibilities even approximately there must be found some way to improve the quality and continuity of pastoral service given them. It would perhaps not be profitable to try to locate the blame—it is doubtless not all in one place. One may, however, venture the opinion that with reasonable liberality on the part of the church and reasonable adaptibility on the part of the preacher, many, if not most of our country and village churches could maintain a full-time pastorate. But as preachers let us not flatter ourselves that the blame is wholly at the door of unfavourable conditions. In spite of this handicap the fourth-time

preacher in many cases could do better if he would try. Usually he could give more time in the field if he would. He could be more energetic in the work, more sympathetic with the work and better equipped for the work if he tried. In the last decade there has been unusual interest in the country life problem. A number of very inspiring and informing books have been written on the subject. Many valuable movements for country life betterment are being projected. The country preacher is culpably careless, almost criminally unfaithful, if by reading, association, investigation and practice he is not keeping in touch with these modern country life discussions and experiments.

(5) Another quality required in the good shepherd (pastor) is *sacrificial service.* Jesus says "the good shepherd layeth down his life for his sheep" (John 10: 14). It is true that in these words He referred primarily to Himself, but no one doubts that the spirit of sacrifice herein proposed applies undiluted and undiminished to the true pastor in every age. The preacher who is not willing to suffer for and with his people is a hireling and not a shepherd. One sacrificial, self-forgetful pastor in a community is a more convincing argument for Christianity than a whole library of apologetics. One self-seeking, sheep-fleecing preacher in a neighbourhood will do more to invalidate Christianity than a ton of infidel literature. Look for a moment at the selfish preacher. Every

road in his psychological cogitations leads to his salary. Every movement of his cunning hand is directed toward his own comfort and his personal interest. He deftly manipulates "poundings" and other special donations, in addition to his regular pay. He cajoles sentimental sisters into raising a special fund to send him luxuriously to the national religious conventions or the world's fair or on a "much needed?" summer vacation while the people who give the money toil and sweat at home. He wheedles money out of his people for himself on this pretext and that. He borrows money from his brethren who cannot afford to lend it and frequently never pays it back. He forgets that he was sent out to minister and not to be ministered unto. He measures a church by what it pays the preacher—the comfort and luxury it affords him. To call such a man pastor is a contradiction in terms. The selfish man is not, and in the nature of the case, cannot be a pastor. He is a parasite—eating the people's bread for nought. He is a leech sucking the blood of those who trust him. It is gladly admitted that such conduct is not the rule among preachers, but it is claimed that there is enough of it to make any observant genuine man sick at heart. Let every man who reads these words join humbly with the man who writes them in the Apostles' question at the Last Supper, "Lord, is it I?" The religions of the past have met their Waterloo in the selfishness of their

priests. Christianity will never perish from the earth. The nebulous thing that we call Christendom will go to pieces and be cast in the junk pile, but Christianity will never fail. Every student of history knows that Christendom's corruption and deflection and degeneration in the past have resulted from corrupt and selfish leadership. That is her menace now and that will be her menance until the end of time. It is a sad day for the flock when the shepherd feeds himself and not the sheep—when he cares for himself and neglects the sheep—when "the hungry sheep look up and are not fed."

The vital importance of this suggestion has not only its bearing on the country church itself—as important as that is admitted to be. It finds perhaps its larger meaning in the fact that the country church is to furnish bone and sinew and leadership to town and city churches. Let our country churches die or lose that stalwart virility and see how speedily and how inevitably fatal results will follow in every city in the land. City churches are mighty in altruistic activities, but for many reasons they do not possess the character-making qualities of the rugged country church. The surest way to take care of our cities is to take care of their fountainhead—the rural neighbourhood.

IV

THE CALL TO THE OFFICE

"Who hath called us with an holy calling."
—2 Timothy 1: 9.

IN discussing this topic, we will undertake to answer thoughtfully four cardinal questions.

1. Are men divinely impressed with the ministry, and definitely called into it by the direct, immediate impact of the Holy Spirit, or is his entrance upon this work, as in other callings, due to personal choice, human influence, or providential circumstances?

2. If this call is by the immediate impact of the Holy Spirit, by what mental processes, human influences or providential conditions may it be interpreted and authenticated? Or how does a man know he is called to preach?

3. How may a church hinder an answer to its prayer for more preachers?

4. What effect will a man's view of the call to the ministry have upon his character and efficiency as a preacher?

I. In the first place then, let us affirm and undertake to prove that men are divinely impressed

with the ministry, and definitely called into it by the direct impact of the Holy Spirit.

1. *The argument from analogy.* The head of every human government appoints directly his ambassadors and official messengers. From the very nature of government we will expect this to be the case. If we find it, and would naturally expect to find it in human government, it raises a strong presumption that we would find it also in divine government. In the Scriptures, the Gospel preacher is called a Herald, an ambassador. Unless he had specific divine calling and appointment, his going on such a mission would hardly receive scriptural approval. "Does not right reason demand that he who declares himself an ambassador for Christ, so that it is as if God spoke by him and he were in the King's stead, must hold a commission consciously from his divine sovereign or be guilty of blasphemous presumption?" (Herrick Johnson).

2. *The argument from testimony.* Tradition is often misleading and a doctrine drawn from it is often false. Yet the views of the fathers on this subject may help us to reach the truth. Here are quotations from a few of them:

Bernard (Burgundy, 1091–1153): "He who is called to instruct souls is called of God and not by his own ambitions, and what is this call but an inward incentive of love soliciting us to be zealous for the salvation of our brothers."

Luther (German, 1483–1546): "Await God's

call. Meantime be satisfied. Yea, though thou wast wiser than Solomon and Daniel, yet, unless thou art called avoid preaching as thou wouldst hell itself."

Bishop Burnett (English, 1643–1715): "I wish it were well considered by all clerics what it is to run without being called, or sent, and so to thrust one's self into the vineyard without being called or sent." And again: "Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office? Certainly the answer to this ought to be well considered, for if one says 'I trust so' that yet knows nothing of any such motion and can give no account of it, lies to the Holy Ghost, and makes his first approach to the altar with a lie on his lips and that not to man but to God." And further: "Our church must be construed to intend by this that it is only Christ that sends, and that the Bishops are only His ministers to pronounce His mission."

Massillon (French, 1663–1742): "If you do not feel in yourself a desire to be employed as an ambassador of God, judge ye yourselves whether ye are called into the Lord's vineyard. God implants a love in the heart for the service to which He calls."

Vinet (Swiss, 1797–1837): "We must then be called of God. A call to the ministry which is exercised in the name of God and in which He is represented can emanate only from Him. The

business here, in fact, is not ours, it is another's, and that is God. In a word, it is a *ministry.* Whether external or internal the call ought to be divine."

John Wesley (English, 1703–1791): "Every minister, before he undertakes to preach the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, ought to be able to say 'the Spirit of the Lord is upon me because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel.'"

Church Rituals: Every church that has any sort of ritual or printed order of service has in the formula for setting apart men to the ministry some expression in which the candidate avows in substance his belief that he is inwardly moved and definitely called by the Holy Spirit to enter upon this office.

These historical citations have no value as evidence other than to show what, along the centuries, has been Christianity's interpretation of the Scripture teaching on this subject. For this purpose alone they are here introduced. This testimony is not intended as proof of the doctrine, but to show that it is not a new doctrine, nor a doctrine advocated by some small mystical segment of Christianity, but that it is a doctrine believed and taught in all ages, in all countries and in all creeds, and to raise the presumption that since our view has been the almost universal interpretation of Scripture, it is probably the correct one.

3. *The argument from Scripture.* We come

now to the heart of the discussion. What saith the Scriptures? To the law and to the testimony. We will first take some Scripture examples of men called into spiritual service and then give two or three Scriptures containing a general statement of the doctrine.

(1) Some Scripture examples. As these cases are cited, bear in mind that the object is to show that all along God has definitely and directly called those who were to be specially set apart for spiritual service. (*a*) Aaron and his sons (Ex. 28: 1): "Take thou unto thee Aaron thy brother and his sons with him from among the children of Israel that he may minister unto me in the Priest's office, even Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar, and Ithamar, Aaron's sons." (1 Chron. 23: 13): "And Aaron was separated that he should sanctify the most holy thing, he and his sons forever, to burn incense before Jehovah, to minister unto him and to bless in his name forever." (Heb. 5: 4): "And no man taketh this honour to himself, but when he is called of God even as was Aaron." (*b*) Elisha (1 Kings 19: 16–19): "And Elisha, the son of Shaphat of Abalmeholah, shalt thou anoint to be prophet in thy room. . . . So he departed thence and found Elisha, the son of Shaphat who was plowing with twelve yoke of oxen before him and he with the twelfth; and Elijah passed over unto him and cast his mantle upon him. . . . Then he arose and went after Elijah and minis-

tered unto him." (*c*) Isaiah (Isa. 6: 8–9): "And I heard the voice of the Lord saying: Whom shall I send and who will go for us? Then I said, Here am I; send me. And he said, Go, and tell this people. . . ." (*d*) Jeremiah (Jer. 1: 5): "Now the word of Jehovah came unto me, saying, Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee; I have appointed thee a prophet unto the nations." (Jer. 3: 15): "I will give my pastors according to my own heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding." (*e*) Jonah (Jonah 1: 1): "Now the word of Jehovah came unto Jonah, the son of Amittai, saying, Arise, go to Nineveh that great city and cry against it for their wickedness is come up before me."

Let us now consider some selected examples from Christ's personal ministry. (*a*) Peter and Andrew (Matt. 4: 18–20): "And walking by the sea of Galilee he saw two brothers, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew, his brother, casting a net into the sea, and he saith unto them, Come ye after me and I will make you fishers of men, and they straightway left their nets and followed him." (*b*) Matthew (Matt. 9: 9): "And as Jesus passed by from thence he saw a man called Matthew sitting at the place of toll, and he saith unto him, Follow me. And he arose and followed him." (*c*) The entire twelve (Matt. 10: 1–7): "And he called unto him the twelve disciples and gave them

authority over unclean spirits to cast them out and to heal all manner of disease, and all manner of sickness. . . . Those twelve Jesus sent forth and charged them, saying . . . as ye go, preach." (*d*) The seventy (Luke 10: 1): "After these things the Lord appointed seventy others and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place whither he himself was about to come."

But lest the brother who is specially strong on "dispensational truth" should object that our New Testament examples are taken from the period of our Lord's personal ministry and do not therefore apply to the Holy Spirit dispensation beginning with Pentecost, let us take a few post-resurrection passages showing how in this dispensation, as in all other dispensations, men get into the ministry and are authenticated for its work by a direct call of the Holy Ghost. (*a*) Matthias (Acts 1: 23–25): "And they appointed two, Joseph and Matthias. And they prayed and said: Thou, Lord, knowest the hearts of all men, show of these two the one that thou hast chosen to take the place in this ministry and apostleship from which Judas fell away." (*b*) Peter (Acts 10: 42): "And he commanded us to preach unto the people and to testify that it was he who was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead." (*c*) Paul (Acts 22: 12–15): "And one Ananias, a devout man, according to the law, well reported of by all the

Jews that dwelt there, came unto me and standing by me said unto me, Brother Saul, receive thy sight, and in that very hour I looked upon him. And he said, The God of our fathers hath appointed thee to know his will, and to see the Righteous One and to hear a voice from his mouth, For thou shalt be a witness for him unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard." (*d*) Barnabas (Acts 13: 2): "And as they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Spirit said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. Then when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them they sent them away. So they being sent forth by the Holy Spirit went down to Seleucia." (*e*) Archippus (Col. 4: 17): "And say to Archippus, Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord that thou fulfill it." (*f*) The Ephesian Elders (Acts 20: 28): "Take heed unto yourselves and to all the flock over which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood."

(2) Having thus given some Scripture examples showing that God calls and sends men into the ministry, let us now consider two or three passages containing a general statement of the doctrine. (*a*) The pastoral office is a direct divine gift. Ephesians 4: 7–11: "But unto each one of us was the grace given according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Wherefore he saith, When he ascended

on high he led captivity captive and gave gifts unto men. And he gave some to be apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering unto the building up of the body of Christ." (*b*) To the tasks of this office men are directly sent of God. Matthew 9: 36–38: "But when he saw the multitudes he was moved with compassion for them because they were distressed and scattered as sheep not having a shepherd. Then saith he unto his disciples, The harvest indeed is great but the labourers are few. Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that he send forth labourers into his harvest." (*c*) For the duties of the office men are definitely anointed of God. Isaiah 61: 1, and Luke 4: 18–19: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor. He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind. To set at liberty them that are bruised. To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord."

II. If this call is by the immediate impact of the Holy Spirit upon man's spirit, by what mental processes, human influences or providential conditions may it be interpreted and authenticated? Or, in plainer English, how may a man know he is called to preach? What are the evidences of this call?

1. *A sense of duty.* Paul said (1 Cor.

9: 16–17): "For though I preach the gospel I have nothing to glory of; for necessity is laid upon me; woe is me if I preach not the gospel. For if I do this of mine own will I have a reward; but if not of mine own will I have a stewardship intrusted to me." When the council (Acts 4: 18) forbade Peter and John to speak or teach in the name of Jesus these conscience-bound disciples answered, "Whether it is right to hearken unto you rather than unto God judge ye, for we cannot but speak the things which we saw and heard." With our most useful preachers the ministry has not been selected as the most inviting calling. Their tastes and natural inclinations are all against the ministry as a life-work, but they are driven to it by a compelling sense of duty. If the testimony of these men may be taken at par, most of them spend months and often years of bitter struggle before yielding to this imperious voice. It is nothing to a man's credit to have fought thus against the will of God, but a ministry assumed after such soul travail is more likely to be devoted and steadfast than if entered on a sudden impulse.

2. *A desire for the work of the ministry.* Paul said (1 Tim. 3: 1): "If a man longeth for the office of a bishop he desireth a good work." There is only an apparent inconsistency between the desire to be a preacher and stubbornly resisting the conviction that one ought to be a preacher. If any preacher will analyze his own experience he

will probably find these two paradoxical mental processes have worked simultaneously in his own heart. But let a man be careful that this longing for the ministry does not grow out of spurious motives. Does he long for it because from his superficial view the ministry offers an easy life? Does he desire it because it seems to give ample opportunity for the indulgence of literary tastes? Does he seek it because it seems to give the best field for the display of his oratorical talents, real or imaginary? Does he covet it because of the social advantage it is supposed to offer? All these are untempered mortar and the ministerial superstructure built with them is doomed to an early and ignominious fall. But if the desire for the ministry grows out of a hunger to rescue lost souls, to build them up for the glory of God and to promote the reign of Christ on earth, that ministry will probably be permanent, joyous, fruitful, triumphant.

3. *Consciousness of qualification for it.* This is a delicate matter and we must be careful lest we reach false conclusions. Perhaps a man is nowhere so blind and incompetent as when he comes to analyze and evaluate his own mental powers. Everywhere may be seen wrecks and dismantled hulks of human life floating aimless and helpless out to sea because, misjudging their own gifts, men refused to do what they could do and frittered away time and opportunity and strength in the vain

effort to do what they could not do. But after all is said it yet remains true that among the other things that determine a man's choice of a calling, there ought to enter the modest conviction that he is, or may become, reasonably qualified to perform the duties implied in that calling—"If he thinks he can, he can: if he thinks he can't, he can't" is like most of our aphorisms not more than half a truth, but it does contain enough truth to restrain a man from assuming a task for which he feels himself neither actually nor potentially qualified. Paul's sense of duty to preach and his sense of woe if he did not preach grew largely out of the modest conviction that he could preach.

4. *The judgment of the Church.* While the testimony of this witness is by no means conclusive, it yet has some probative value. If it should become the practically unanimous opinion of a church that one of its members bore the New Testament marks of a preacher, it ought to produce on his mind a very strong presumption that his brethren were correctly interpreting the will of God concerning him. It rarely happens that a church discovering the gifts proposes the ministry to a man who has given no sign of his own inclinations in that direction. In the few cases that have fallen within my limited observation, subsequent events have proven that the church was right. I would not, however, put as much emphasis upon the opposition of the church to a man's entering

the ministry. My reason is the natural tendency to discount the home boy in accordance with the psychological principle enunciated by Jesus when He spoke of a prophet having more recognition everywhere else than in his own country and among his home people. It is often difficult for an unseeing church to recognize the sculptor's potential angel in the block of stone when a commonplace boy brought up in the neighbourhood begins to manifest a yearning for the ministry. The judgment of his church touching a young man's aspirations toward the ministry is not infallible but it does have enough weight to demand that he give it careful consideration before reaching his conclusion.

5. *Providential circumstances.* Bereavement, failure of a business enterprise, unsought demands for ministerial service, a passing suggestion by a friend and many such things have been used to interpret duty and the will of God to a wavering soul. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, affords a striking illustration of this point. He was prætor of Liguria and Amelia. The bishopric of Milan had been vacant for a long time. All efforts to fill it failed because of the controversy between the Athanasians and the Aryans. Feeling was so tense that at one of the meetings a riot broke out in the church. Governor Ambrose came in as a civil officer to quell the riot, when a little boy cried out: "Ambrose, bishop! Ambrose, bishop!" The peo-

ple took up the cry and the council then and there elected him bishop. He had never dreamed of filling such an office, but considering all the circumstances he finally yielded to it as the call of God. Of all the preachers of the early centuries none was more devoted and useful. He immediately relinquished his high civil office, distributed his vast wealth for benevolent purposes and devoted himself to spiritual things with tireless zeal. It is true that one may easily become a superstitious fanatic by giving to every passing occurrence a spiritual interpretation. It is equally true, however, that we may fatally miss the divine will by not having an ear attent to the voice of God in His providential dealing.

6. *A degree of success in it.* In 1 Corinthians 4: 2, Paul teaches that faithfulness and not success is the true criterion for the preacher. What preacher has not in times of spiritual barrenness comforted himself with that passage? But if the preacher's labours continue unfruitful he may well question the genuineness of his call. If God calls a man to preach He will call somebody to hear him, and somebody who will want to hear him and somebody who will be helped when he hears him. It is true that in the ministry there are "gifts differing," but if after fair trial a man finds no place where he can work and no sphere where he can succeed, he ought to accept it as a providential indication that he answered some other man's call.

Either he has not been called to the work or there is something wrong in his life. He perhaps belongs to that class to whom one of our naive evangelists refers when he says: "A slow mule and a hot sun has called many a man to preach." Victor Hugo said Napoleon had to be removed because he embarrassed God. I have often wondered if the chronic churchless preacher does not do that same thing.

III. In Matthew 9: 38, Jesus said, "Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that he send forth labourers into his harvest." How do the churches hinder the answer to this prayer?

1. *By not offering the prayer.* How often has the reader heard a man pray in obedience to this command of Jesus? When and how many times has he known the church called together to render specific obedience to this command? We hear prayers for the salvation of sinners, for the revival of the church, for the healing of the sick, for God's protecting providence for absent loved ones, and for all forms of temporal blessing, but how rarely have we prayed or heard others pray that God will thrust out labourers into His harvest. In every quarter we hear complaint of the dearth of ministerial recruits. Might not God rebuke this complaint by saying: "Ye have not because ye ask not." Are we not one and all guilty of disobedience to this specific command to pray for labourers?

2. *By discounting the home boy.* It is not easy for the average church member to believe that the familiar commonplace neighbour boy can possibly be God's choice for the high office of the ministry. Some one has said: "No man is a hero to his own valet." The same psychological principle is suggested in the threadbare proverbs: "Distance lends enchantment to the view," and "Familiarity breeds contempt." This tendency to discredit the home boy is illustrated in what the people said about Jesus in rebuttal of some of His mighty works. "Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary? And his brethren and his sisters are they not all with us?" One of the most distinguished ministers in this country says that when about eighteen he went timidly to his father and told him that he felt called to preach. Whereupon the father rebuked him saying: "Dismiss that from your mind; none of our people have ever been preachers. We are just plain tradesmen. You are just as ordinary as the rest of us and God does not mean you to be a preacher." He was so discouraged by this unsympathetic attitude of his father that for months he smothered his heart's conviction. When at last he could keep quiet no longer he went trembling to his mother and told her of his impressions and convictions. She threw her arms about his neck and said: "My prayer is answered! Oh, thank God that I should be counted worthy to bear and bring up one who

is to preach the gospel of my Lord!" The father in this story is the type of the church as it is. The mother the type of the church as it ought to be.

3. *By a failure to encourage him and coöperate with him in securing equipment for his work.* In the average church, after the young preacher has run the gauntlet of indifference and the church has somewhat reluctantly "liberated him to preach," he finds little encouragement to prepare himself for the work. If the brethren think about it at all they think he has about all the education he needs, or if he needs more he ought to get it without encouragement or coöperation from them. In glorious contrast to this customary callous attitude is the story told by one of our former students. He says that the day he was licensed to preach in the little country church a good brother, poor and uneducated, arose and said: "Now if Brother Charlie is going to preach he ought to get an education. Poor like the rest of us, he can't very well get it by himself. I'll divide what my little farm makes next year to help him through Baylor University." Others followed his example; they helped him one year and after that Charlie was able to make his own way through school. All about us there are noble young men who have felt impressed with the duty of preaching. But uneducated and seeing no way of getting an education they have stifled these impressions. If we pray God to call men into this work are we not hindering the answer to our

prayer if we fail to encourage them and coöperate with them in the important matter of securing the best possible equipment for the work?

IV. What effect will a man's view of his call to the ministry have upon his character and efficiency? If a man feels that he has been directly called of God, definitely summoned by the Holy Ghost to preach the Gospel, it will give a romantic dignity, a knightly chivalry and sacrificial devotion otherwise impossible. On this point Herrick Johnson forcibly says: "If he feels that God has called him into the ministry in a way in which men are called to no other pursuit—then at once and forever it is to him peculiarly sacred, a divine work not to be undertaken and prosecuted save with an active and absolute consecration and not to be secularized or made subservient to selfish interests or ambitions at the peril of his soul. But if he is there, prompted by considerations of ease or literary indulgence or oratorical ambition or social possibilities. . . . Oh, the pity of it all! And the shame! And the sin! But he who can say: 'Lord, I heard Thy call; it was Thou that didst send me'—what can he fear to do or dare or suffer?" It was this solemn sense of a divine call that led Dr. B. H. Carroll to say on the subject: "I made a solemn covenant with God that while I lived I would never have any other business or profession or calling than to preach the Gospel—to give myself wholly to that, 'sink or swim, live or die, survive or per-

ish,' to turn back to any other never, *never, never forever.*" If a man goes into the ministry because he wants to, while in it he will conduct himself as he wants to and go out of it when he wants to, but if he realizes that he is put there by the sovereign call of God he will try to please God while in it, and he will stay in it till he receives a divine summons to give it up.

V

THE PERMANENCE OF THE OFFICE

"Go ye into all the world and preach . . . till the consummation of the age."—MARK 16: 15; MATTHEW 28: 20.

IS the preacher a permanent functionary in the church or has he, because of changing conditions, about served his day? If his position is permanent, will it continue to carry its old-time influence and power? Will he be in the future as in the past the mightiest master of the public mind —or is he to become an official figurehead—a mere Samson in a treadmill shorn of his strength, ceaselessly performing, but getting nowhere? Is the pastoral office now on the wane and doomed to ultimate desuetude or is it divinely endowed with an inherent resiliency that guarantees its permanent position and power?

In the preceding lecture two or three basic principles were announced that would imply in a general way the permanence of this office. In this lecture we will elaborate those general propositions giving in detail some of the arguments on both

sides of the question. Let us meet the issue squarely, and weigh the arguments fairly.

I. Some Things That Seem to Threaten the Permanence of the Office

In this division, we shall discuss the menace of some inherent weaknesses on the part of those who fill the office and the portent of some unpropitious atmospheres that surround it.

1. Some inherent weaknesses of those who fill the office. The most serious menace to the permanence of the pastoral office is the weakness of its incumbents. The first, and perhaps most alarming pastoral weakness to be mentioned is:

(1) *Doubt in the pulpit.* If the arbitrary cocksureness of ignorance is sometimes laughable, the impotent uncertainty and imbecile hesitancy often affected by so-called scholarship is always pathetic. The people love a bold preacher. Intuitively they despise a parson much-afraid.

If a crude empiric will preach a half truth, with no doubt in his own mind as to its validity, with boldness and sincerity in its delivery, the people will crown him teacher. But if a cultured gentleman will preach a whole truth falteringly, hedged about with interrogation points, and spoken with a rising inflection, the people will dethrone him though he were an angel of light. Those who see or think they see a growing laxity in holding and limpness in proclaiming the great spiritual doc-

trines of revelation, regard it an ominous sign for the future of the pastoral office. They say this office will not survive the loss of men who know and know they know. They tell us that men of that sort in the pulpit are growing perilously scarce; that the men who preach their doubts instead of the great doctrines, or who, if they preach the great doctrines, do it in a subdued and apologetic way are increasing at a dangerous rate; that the only archbishop the people want in the pulpit is the arch believer; that the people will maintain only the ministry that can cure their doubts rather than feed them; that if they cannot get that brand they will have none. A minister once asked David Garrick: "How is it that you speak fiction to people and they are moved, while I speak eternal truth and they are not moved?" Garrick replied: "It is because you speak truth as if it were fiction, while I speak fiction as if it were truth." The preacher ought to believe his message and deliver it like one who believes it, or he ought to get out. Humanly speaking, Christianity's future is in the hands of her preachers. Would that future be more virile and masterful and triumphant if the office were summarily relieved of all its timorous and time-serving incumbents even though it meant a Gideon's decrease?

(2) *The abuse of books.* More and more the preacher is being fed on books. More and more his preaching is a restatement of what others have

thought and discovered. He is fast becoming the purveyor of warmed-over foods; the vendor of second-hand goods; the public caterer of theological hash. He lives in an atmosphere of books written by men long since dead and his sermons are clothed in the cerements of the grave. Being constantly fed on concentrated and predigested pabulum, he has lost the habit of masticating and digesting strong meat on his own account. He thinks in an atmosphere where nobody has lived for at least a hundred years, and talks in a vocabulary appropriate thereto. This arraignment of the preacher is, in my judgment, altogether too severe, but this is in substance what his critics—keen, thoughtful and perhaps a trifle censorious,—are saying of him throughout the land. There is enough truth in it to make every conscientious preacher sit up and take notice. In our school days, the boy who undertook to ride a "pony" through his Latin course did not have much standing, but he was a brilliant success compared to the twentieth century preacher who undertakes to hobble through life on his library crutches. Those who have analyzed the case say that a chief element of "Billy" Sunday's strength is in the fact that, while his sermons give evidence of careful study and preparation, they do not smell of the library, and while his doctrines and propositions are accurately and transparently stated, they are not in the language of the dead theologian, but in the

vernacular of the living street. What a mighty thing is a vocabulary! Spurgeon caught the ear of the world's masses by the use of homespun English. His workaday words were earthen vessels, but they bore the heavenly treasure to multitudes of impoverished souls. A venerable parishioner of the days of my youth once said to me: "If I were a preacher I would preach one big sermon, have it printed and pass it around wherever I went to let the folks know I could do it. After that I would just talk right out to the people in words they could understand." It did not occur to me then, but looking backward, I wonder if the good man thus timidly sought to correct his young pastor's tendency to sesquipedalian pyrotechnics—which, being interpreted, means "hot air" in big words.

When Jesus came He found the religious teachers walking about in dead men's clothes frittering away valuable time in petty inconsequentialities, balancing Hillel against Shammai to establish the proper width of a phylactery and disputing one with another always in classic language on what the fathers taught concerning the question of how many angels could sit comfortably on the point of a needle. All this learned attention to tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee while the wolves of leprosy and blindness and epilepsy and paralysis and demoniacal possession and poverty and Roman oppression harried the sheep committed to their care.

In the sermon on the mount Jesus put Himself in sharp contrast with them by brushing aside these traditional anachronous forms of speech and methods of reasoning and going at once to original fundamental principles. Observe His three steps "Ye have heard that it was said"—traditionalism exposed. "From the beginning it hath not been so"—fundamental principles invoked. "And I say unto you"—a fresh modern view of a tradition—obscured elemental truth announced. Such was the method and such the charm of Frederick W. Robertson, and such will be the method of the modern pulpit, if it will maintain its prestige and power. Please notice that the subject of this paragraph is "the abuse of books." We are facing the west now, but there is an east. In another lecture we will face the rising sun, and talk about "the use of books"—a glorious theme.

(3) *Professionalism.* Amending the ritual of our Episcopal brethren, I would have every church pray, "From the machine-made professional preacher, good Lord, deliver us." Colleges and seminaries are sinners, but not the only sinners in this matter. There is danger that seven years of professional training will turn the young preacher out more a machine and less a man. The secretary of the faculty of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary was one day notifying his colleagues by telephone of a faculty meeting. In calling my house the negro cook, no one else being at home,

answered the telephone. When I came in to lunch she announced "Dat ar 'Fesser Conner he done 'phone down here for you to come up to de fact'ry at two o'clock." Formerly she had called the Seminary "de temple." From that day it was in her patois "de factory." The last notion of that darkey was worse than the first. A theological seminary ought not to be a factory where big original independent souls are whittled down to fit a regulation groove. It ought to be rather a temple in whose holy of holies these glowing young souls meet God and on whose altar-stairs they touch the garment-hem of spirit-filled prophets with the gift of arousing latent powers, and stirring smouldering ambitions and quickening chivalrous ideals. The best theological professor is the man who in a given time can grow in his student the most man—the most high-minded, chivalrous godlike man. A theological faculty is likest God when, fronting its tasks, it says: "Let us make man." But facing the east let us not deny the west. You cannot grow much man in a young preacher's anatomy till you have animated him with a passion for honest, earnest, painstaking, persistent study. Emotional lectures and exclamatory exhortations and unctuous expostulations may please and even stir the student for a passing moment, but these do not grow character. Genius is at yon end of hard work.

But theological seminaries have no exclusive

franchise for the production of the professional machine-made preacher. A young acquaintance of mine, who scouted theological training, when being congratulated by a friend on his entering the ministry said: "Yes, I'm in it. It is my chosen profession, and I never expect to stop till I'm a Doctor of Divinity." He talked about rising in the profession and the promotion of this man and that as glib as a young army officer. My own notion is that a few months in a real theological seminary would have shown him the difference between a calling and a profession,—between doing a work and getting a position. It might not be amiss to say parenthetically that he soon gave up his "chosen profession" to become a cheap-john actor in a third-rate theatre. The last time I heard of him he was window decorator in a millinery store! The professional preacher grades the churches by what they pay and his brother preachers by what they get. He talks about a "pull" with men higher up, and calls his pastorate his "job." When he is asked to resign, as he usually is, he has "lost his job," and opens an organized, systematic campaign for another. My prayer is that he may never get it. This professional preacher, this denatured shepherd, this quack in cloth, "veneered with sanctimonious theory" threatens, seriously threatens, the permanency of the pastoral office. The people are saying that we have too many professions. Once let the pastoral

office degenerate to the level of a mere profession, and the people will abolish it, and divide its supposed responsibilities between the doctor, the school teacher, the political reformer and also the undertaker.

(4) *Money craze.* A glaring instance here and there of a preacher "greedy of filthy lucre" has led some pessimistic souls to the conclusion that the pastoral office is about to be swamped in the money maelstrom. The modern high cost of living and the cost of modern high living both tempt the preacher to subordinate the eternal to the temporal—the spiritual to the financial. It is a sad confession, but it cannot be denied that many in our day are yielding to this insidious temptation. The critic says that the preacher hears the loudest call from the place that offers the largest salary. This is often true. Sometimes it is right that it should be true. Opportunities of usefulness being equal why should not a preacher go to the place that offers the best comfort for his family, the best education for his children, and the best protection for old age? A man does not necessarily become a fool when he enters the ministry. But having said this, let us hasten to say that the preacher who turns his ministry into a money-making machine, or who for money's sake modifies his course or his message a hair's breadth, is contributing his part toward undermining the office into which he claims to be called. What could sap

preaching of its romance more effectually than a hireling ministry?

(5) *Wanderlust.* Nothing disgusts the thoughtful layman with his preacher brother more than his nomadic habits. A preacher friend of mine in an eastern city tells of one of his lady members who went to call on another lady member, on the occasion of her return from a trip to Europe. She was met at the door by a coloured woman who surprised her with the information that the lady of the house had just gone to New York. "Why," said the lady, "I thought she had just returned from Europe." "Yassum, she done jus' git back from Urup, but you know she dat kind o' 'ooman what all time want to be whar she ain't." A layman sitting by whispered to me, "The average preacher is like that." I confessed and denied not, but confessed that he was right. The people are saying that if God had anything to do with putting men into the pastoral office He would make the relation a little more sacred and permanent. The more they are led to believe that the pastor in his official relation is fickle, unstable, unreliable, the more they will doubt the divine origin of the office. Faith in its divine origin gone, their willingness to perpetuate it goes also. If every pastorate were entered with a distinct conviction that this relation is of God the pastoral tether would be perceptibly lengthened, and the people's respect for the office immeasurably deepened. But while de-

ploring the instability of the pastoral relation, we must not forget that this look at the east has its western complement. A pastorate may be too long. We have no New Testament examples of long pastorates except perhaps James at Jerusalem. During his long pastorate, the church nearly died of dry rot. And Antioch, under the brief, but brilliant joint-pastorate of Saul and Barnabas displaced her as queen of the churches. Now and then the newspapers mirate over this or that pastorate covering a period of thirty or forty or fifty years. But usually when you analyze the case you find that the church would have been better if the pastorate had been shorter. The proper length of a pastorate cannot be determined by the calendar. When the proper proportionate length of a man's legs was a topic of conversation, Abraham Lincoln said he thought they ought to be about long enough to touch the ground. A pastorate ought to continue just as long as the relation is evidently blessed of God. Whatever may be the personal wish on either side, it ought not to go a day beyond that, nor stop a day short of that. My observation has been that when a preacher begins to plume himself on account of his long pastorate, the church needs a change. Some preachers do not stay long enough; some stay too long. More, far more of the former than the latter. Seeking the will of God, let us avoid both Scylla and Charybdis.

(6) *Petty politics.* Playing politics is about the

cheapest business that ever engaged the talents of a preacher. The critics are charging that the preachers are becoming political wire-pullers for personal promotion. So long as the ministry is recruited from flesh and blood, we may expect to find a modicum of every human weakness in its ranks. A lifelong intimate and somewhat extensive acquaintance with preachers leads me to believe that this folly is not common among them.

II. Some Unpropitious Atmospheres Surrounding the Office

These are not all bad. Some of the best things in our modern life are in their very nature friendly competitors of the pulpit.

(1) *Cheap, abundant and wholesome literature.* The very best literature is in everybody's reach. Even religious people are feeling that church-going is no longer necessary, since religious instruction and inspiration just as good and even better can be had at home. This subdivision does not include the preacher's chief competitor—the Sunday newspaper. Nor does it describe it. It is cheap enough, altogether too abundant, but not very wholesome.

(2) *The developed educational and social life of the church.* The time was when the pulpit with its accessories was almost the sole channel of church activity. Now apart from the pulpit, the church life functions in the Sunday school, the young peo-

ple's organizations, the women's societies, the men's brotherhoods, etc. In nearly every church there are those who are active in one or another of these organizations and do not care for the ministrations of the pulpit. If you have any doubt here, listen next Sunday to the preacher's pathetic plea with his Sunday-school forces to "remain for church," and then notice how many of them, indifferent to his appeal, file out and go hence.

(3) *The multiplicity of other more or less wholesome opportunities of entertainment and instruction.* The time was when the preacher was the intellectual centre of the community. There was only the pulpit and the schoolroom and a meagre literature, and the preacher was master in the three spheres. He has lost the schoolroom, he is producing only a modicum of the world's wholesome or even religious literature, and such forces as the Y. M. C. A., the lyceum courses, and the modern layman's movements are contesting his franchise on the pulpit. Thus, the critics say, modern life movements are crowding the preacher into a corner, and thus they say the pastoral office will soon become an empty shell that nobody will want.

(4) *The multiplicity of lodges and other benevolent orders.* Sam Jones said, "The Mooses, the Elks and the Eagles have organized and I am expecting the buzzards to organize next." In deprecating the multitude of these orders, the preachers usually begin with the apologetic remark: "I have

nothing to say against secret orders." I have not either except that I cannot think of a single good reason why a preacher or any other church member should belong to one. In years of observation, I have rarely known a man who was high up and active in a lodge who was at the same time high up and active in his church. I have never known a preacher—not one—who was high up and active in lodge life, who stood high among the churches as a man of marked spiritual power. When I was a young preacher, they told me that if I would join the lodges it would widen my influence for Christ. I tried it, but it did not "pan out." Confessedly, lodge men themselves being witnesses, the lodge is secondary to the church. Lodge men admire most, and are influenced most by the preacher who is so busy with the main thing that he does not find time for the secondary. They are not fighting them, and many may nominally hold membership in them, but it is an axiom that the typical New Testament preachers are not active in the lodges. The best way for the preacher to meet this menace of the lodge is to let others join them if they will or must while he gives himself "continually to prayer and the ministry of the word." The preacher can use all his cars on the main line and then have more track space than he can fill. The wise young preacher will avoid all side tracks.

(5) *The increasing expense of attending public worship.* In cities (and half our people are living

in cities now) if a man has a wife and three children it costs him fifty cents car-fare to hear a sermon. Then the cost of dressing for church is constantly increasing. The average woman is not willing to go if she and her children cannot dress as well as others. Again the financial budget necessary to support the church in its local activities and in its benevolent and missionary enterprises is increasing year by year. The average man is not willing to go if he cannot contribute liberally to these frequent financial calls.

III. Some Things That Assure Its Permanence

The sky is not falling every time a cabbage leaf shadows a gosling's path. The pastoral office will be here smiling at its critics when their "dust shall be found stopping a bung-hole." This conclusion finds its basis in the following considerations:

1. *In terms used when the office was established*—"Go preach, go make disciples, go baptize, go into the whole world and I am with you to the consummation of this age." Jesus foresaw all the adverse conditions we have been considering, and yet looking to the end of the age, He saw the gospel preacher still busy with his task, blessed by divine presence and endued with divine power.

2. *In the scrupulous attention given to the equipment of its incumbents,* Jesus gave three years of almost undivided attention to the training of the

twelve. One-fourth of Paul's letters are on the subject of the pastoral office. The deacon's office was created that men in this office might be wholly set apart to their high functions. Would such care be taken if the office were an ephemeral one?

3. *In an ever increasing need for it.* If the office was ever needed, it is needed now to mould a heterogeneous population, to direct a constantly advancing intelligence, to combat a growing scepticism, to restrain an increasing worldiness, to combine and direct along spiritual lines new discoveries and inventions in the material world, to interpret God as He speaks through a multitude of modern movements.

4. *In its inherent resilience.* Have you noticed how soon a community recovers from what would seem irremediable lapses in this office? Gross scandal unfrocks the leading minister in the community. One would think the church would never recover from it, and that such a community would never again trust a preacher, but such is the resilient vitality of this office that within six months the church rallies from its humiliation and gives the new pastor unstinted confidence. Mash an egg-shell and it is a permanent wreck. Mash a rubber ball and when the pressure is removed it assumes its original shape. The pastoral office is not an egg-shell. The fact that it has survived the recreancy of so many of its incumbents from Judas till now raises a presumption amounting to practical certainty that it will never pass away.

VI

THE MAINTENANCE OF THE OFFICE

"The labourer is worthy of his hire."
—LUKE 10: 7.

THE true preacher is not in the ministry of his own choice. He feels himself to be there by the will of God. He is there because, with a clear conscience he cannot do otherwise. He has not sent himself. He is sent of God. In Matthew 9: 38 Jesus said to His disciples: "Pray ye therefore the Lord of the Harvest that he send forth labourers into the harvest." The Greek word translated "send forth" is a much stronger word than our English translation implies. It is the verb used where Jesus drove the money changers from the Temple, and where the devils were cast out and where the wheat was thrown from the ship during Paul's shipwreck and where reference is made to Hagar being driven from the house of Abraham. It implies constraint, almost compulsion. To translate it, "thrust out" would be a mild rendering of the Greek word. Such translation would be consistent with the mental and spiritual processes through which the average preacher passes in getting into the min-

istry. It was this sense of being thrust into the ministry that led Paul to say: "For if I preach the Gospel I have nothing to glory of for *necessity* is laid upon me; for woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel. For if I do this of mine own will, I have a reward but if not of mine own will, I have a stewardship intrusted to me."

Now, if God thus lays His hand on certain men and by one providential method or another thrusts them out of a chosen calling into the ministry, He will, we may be sure, make some adequate permanent provision for their support. He will not reproduce the ancient Egyptian cruelty of requiring His servants to make bricks without straw. If, in the Mosaic dispensation, He made provision for the support of those whom He required to give themselves to service in the temple and at the altar He must have intended to make a like provision for those who render similar service in the new dispensation. The New Testament clearly sets out the principle of ministerial support and gives sufficient details as to the method of applying this principle.

It is of the highest importance that a young man entering the ministry should have correct views on the matter of his temporal support. Right thinking here is vital. I shall never cease to thank God that in my boyhood ministry the teaching and example of B. H. Carroll gave me high and, I am sure, scriptural ideas on this subject. It has been

and is my prayer that in lectures on this question year after year I may leave in the hearts of my students the lessons I learned from him, and that where I have tarnished his teaching they may burnish it.

The money-heart is the preacher's ever-present menace. It blasts the brightest prospect, blights the noblest plans, and mildews the rosiest dreams. It saps preaching of its romance, service of its knighthood and sacrifice of its chivalry. It debases ideals, attenuates vision and emasculates heroism. It clogs prayer, clips the wings of faith and defiles meditation. It dehearts orthodoxy, enervates evangelism and paralyzes missions. The New Testament bristles with illustrations of the ruin wrought by the love of money. It led to the betrayal of Jesus (Mark 14: 10); it led to an age-long lie about the resurrection (Matt. 28: 12–15); it led to shameful hypocrisy and lying to the Holy Spirit (Acts 4: 36–5: 5); it led to a blasphemous offer in the matter of spiritual power (Acts 8: 18); it led to the continued cruel imprisonment of one of God's noblest servants (Acts 24: 26).

Money-lust is bad everywhere and in whomsoever, but it is more speedily, more completely and more irretrievably fatal to the preacher than to any other man in the whole world. It was to a preacher that Paul wrote: "They that are minded to be rich fall into a temptation and a snare and many foolish and hurtful lusts such as drown men

in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil which many reaching after have been led astray from the faith and have pierced themselves through with many sorrows" (1 Tim. 6: 9–10).

This solemn warning of the aged preacher to his younger brother finds its authentication in the wrecked life of every preacher who has willfully disregarded it. Money-making and preaching were never successfully pursued by the same man. Tampering with money has probably burned the fingers of more preachers than any other folly.

Whatever may be said of this possible exception or that the great truth holds that the preacher ought to have no other business than preaching and no other means of support than that which comes in return for his ministry. In pioneer times there was some justification for the preacher who farmed in order to preach. These hardy path-finders deserve double honour. They farmed not for the love of money, but from the love of preaching. They felt Paul's "woe" if they did not preach. There were no churches to support them and no mission boards to send them, so they farmed that they might preach. Many of them were so nobly and sincerely consecrated to preaching that most of us are unworthy to untie their shoes. If Paul ever made tents for money it could be justified only by like exceptional and extraordinary conditions. But the time when such a combination

was necessary has passed. In this day and in this country if a preacher has reasonable ability, average training and genuine consecration he will not only be led to a field, but will find a modest but sufficient support in that field. In my judgment nothing is more certain than the proposition that God will provide a support for the spirit-called, spirit-filled preacher who will once for all cut loose from every money-earning enterprise and give himself wholly and zealously to prayer and the ministry of the Word.

In the ninth chapter of First Corinthians there is a very illuminating discussion of this fundamental principle. In it Paul adopts various forms of argument to prove that the preacher should have no other calling but should get his support out of his ministry. In verse six he says: "Or I only and Barnabas have not we power to forbear working?" He is making an argument, *a fortiori,* to show that whether they exercise it or not, he and Barnabas have a right to a support from the ministry and in order to have proper premise for his argument, he clearly implies that all other workers were thus supported. In verse eleven he says: "If we sowed unto you spiritual things is it a great matter that we shall reap your carnal things?" In this verse also he is making the argument from the stronger to the weaker showing that the man who gives himself to spiritual service has a right to carnal support. Verses seven, nine

and thirteen read: "What soldier ever serveth at his own charges? Who planteth a vineyard and eateth not of the fruit thereof? Or who feedeth a flock and eateth not of the milk of the flock? For it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn. Is it for oxen that God careth or saith he it altogether for our sakes? Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple, and they which wait at the altar have their portion with the altar?" In these verses he undertakes to show by six arguments from analogy that the gospel preacher ought to have no secular calling. These analogies are drawn from the soldier, the planter, the shepherd, the thresher, the servant in the temple and the priest at the altar. In his question: "Is it for oxen that God careth?" he suggests a striking *a fortiori* argument which put into syllogistic form would be:

God is more apt to permit want to a faithful ox than to a faithful preacher.

But God does not permit want to a faithful ox.

Therefore, God does not permit want to a faithful preacher.

But the most conclusive part of this argument is the fourteenth verse: "Even so did the Lord ordain that they which proclaim the Gospel should live of the Gospel." This verse may be considered from five points of view. It may be regarded as a prophecy—foretelling that the preacher is to be

supported from his ministry. Or it may be regarded as permissive—authorizing the preacher to demand a support from those to whom he ministers. Or it may be looked upon as a promise, assuring the faithful preacher that he will be supported. Or it may be counted as a command to the preacher—requiring him to live on what his ministry brings him. Or it may be interpreted as a command to the churches, requiring them to provide temporal support for those who minister to them spiritually. Doubtless, all these ideas are in the text, the last two perhaps being the main thought. Most of our confusion and distressing blunders and humiliating failures in the matter of pastoral support arise from a refusal to apply these principles when the pastoral relation is begun. From these Scriptures and many others of like import it is easy to see that the New Testament ideal is that the preacher shall have no other means of support than his ministry and that the churches must ungrudgingly supply this means of support. Whatever capital may be made of supposed exceptions, it is clear that the Lord intends that His preachers shall give themselves wholly to that work, having no other business as a means of support. In my own heart there is an abiding conviction that the preacher who disregards this divine law and turns aside even partially or temporarily to money-making, does it at his peril. He is sowing to the wind and will reap the whirlwind. It is

equally true that the church that, disobeying this divine law, fails to provide pastoral support, cannot prosper.

Let us now give a little attention to the much exploited supposed exception in Paul's tent-making experience. The passage (Acts 18: 1–4) reads, "After these things he (Paul) departed from Athens and came to Corinth and he found a certain Jew named Aquila—with his wife Priscilla—and he came unto them and because he was of the same trade he abode with them and they wrought, for by their trade they were tent makers. And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath and persuaded Jews and Greeks. But when Silas and Timothy came down from Macedonia Paul was constrained," etc. Please notice four things: (1) Paul did not give up preaching to make tents, but preached every Sabbath and so fervently that he persuaded both Jews and Greeks. (2) There is no record that he received pay for this tent making. (3) In 2 Corinthians 11: 9 he says that at this very time his necessities were being supplied by the Macedonia brethren. (4) In 2 Corinthians 11: 7–8 he says, "Or did I commit a sin—because I preached the Gospel of God to you for nought? I robbed other churches taking wages of them that I might minister unto you?" In this passage he distinctly asserts that at the very time it is claimed he was making tents for a living he was taking wages from other churches and seriously raises the

question if he had not committed a sin in not requiring the Corinthian church to bear its proportionate share of his temporal support. One cannot help wondering if the evils in the Corinthian church which Paul deplores in his letters to it, may not be due, at least in part, to the bad start it got in the fundamental question of pastoral support. In my opinion the facts in the tent-making case are about as follows: Paul went to Corinth for a several weeks' evangelistic campaign. He was entertained in the home of Aquila and Priscilla. Being an industrious man and a high-minded man, he was unwilling to loaf around the place between preaching services while his host and hostess were working at a job in which he was an expert. So between services he helped them with their work to offset their expense in feeding him and perhaps to offset the time they lost in attending his revival meetings. Take a modern example. A young preacher graduated from a Texas college the latter part of the nineteenth century. During the session he had kept a monthly preaching appointment in a near-by country church. He was to begin a meeting there two weeks after school closed. He had not enough money to pay expenses home nor to pay board in town so he decided to go out and stay with the brethren in the country neighbourhood till time for the meeting to begin. It was threshing time, "hands" were scarce, so the young preacher took his place on the thrasher and "cut

binds" for much of the two weeks. He received no pay nor thought of receiving any. But, being an independent, if not a very industrious, youth he was unwilling to loaf around and eat the farmer's bread for nought while everybody else was at work. At the close of the meeting the young preacher could have said to the Speegleville church just what Paul said to the Ephesian church, "Ye yourselves know that these hands have ministered unto my necessities and them that were with me," and just what Paul said to this Corinthian church, referring to his tent making, "when I was present with you, I was chargeable to no man. I kept myself from being burdensome unto you." If we do not infer that the modern young preacher had gone into the business of "cutting binds" for a living, why must we, from an almost identical case, infer that Paul went into the tent-making business for a living?

But, while not admitting it, but denying it, let us grant for argument's sake that in Corinth Paul actually made tents for money. The concession affords our twentieth century secularizing preacher no comfort. The cases are not enough alike in principle to justify an argument from analogy. Pioneering the Gospel in heathen cities might occasionally bring about a condition demanding an exception to a well-established custom and clearly enunciated New Testament law. But, granting the exception in such an extreme case does not at all

justify the secularization of the ministry in a land where Christians are plentiful, churches are established and financial ability unquestioned. In an emergency of extreme hunger David ate the shew bread in direct violation of law and was held blameless, but no one would suppose that this exceptional case, growing out of necessity, would justify David in including shew bread in his ordinary bill of fare. In a similar emergency, Jesus justified His disciples in harvesting some wheat on the Sabbath day. But no sane sincere farmer would cite that case to justify running his binder all day Sunday.

Having thus given some attention to Paul's instruction to the churches on this subject and having studied his personal example in the matter, let us see what he says about it to the young preacher.

In 1 Timothy 4: 13–15 we find him saying, " Till I come give heed to reading, to exhortation, to teaching. Neglect not the gift that is in thee. Be diligent in these things, give thyself wholly to them, that thy progress may be manifest to all." In these verses the apostle assigns his young pupil a task, " reading, exhortation and teaching "—which, if faithfully discharged, would preclude a secular calling. Furthermore, he gives him a warning—" neglect not the gift "—which he cannot heed if he is to give himself to business affairs, for whatever may be said in defense of the preacher in business, it cannot be denied that in proportion

as he gives himself to business, he will neglect the preaching gift. But Paul explicitly and unequivocally forbade Timothy having any secular calling when he commanded him (verse 15) to give himself wholly to the work of the ministry. In 2 Timothy 2: 4–6, he says, "No soldier on service entangleth himself with the affairs of this life, that he may please him who enrolled him as a soldier. And if also a man contend in the games he is not crowned except he contend lawfully. The husbandman that laboureth must be the first to partake of the fruits." In these verses he sets forth three persons whose duties are analogous to those of the preacher—the soldier, the athlete and the farmer. Based on these, he makes three arguments from analogy. He contends first that if the soldier has no right to engage in business while in the army, neither has the preacher while in the ministry. His second argument is that if an athlete forfeits the crown unless he plays the game according to the rules, so the preacher will lose his reward and fail of divine approval if he violate the rules of his calling by entangling himself with secular business. His third argument is if the farmer is given and required to exercise, preeminent and precedent, the right to eat of the fruits of his labour, so the preacher is given, and required to exercise, the right to live from the fruits of his labour. In 2 Timothy 4: 10, he speaks with evident disapproval of the young

brother Demas, who, forsaking the gospel ministry, embarked in business at Thessalonica.

Thus we see that in Paul's talk to the churches, in his personal example and in his advice to the young preachers, he consistently and persistently demands a ministry free from secular entanglements and wholly consecrated to this romantic calling.

The instruction of the churches on this subject of ministerial support is sadly, almost criminally, neglected. No subject of like importance receives so little attention from the preacher in his pulpit ministrations or his personal pastoral instruction. Some neglect to teach the duty of pastoral support because they are so obsessed with iridescent dreams and Utopian theories that they cannot come down to a thing so practical. Others neglect it because of a spurious timidity lest they seem to be preaching for money. Still others neglect it because they do not realize how fundamentally the doctrine is grounded in Scripture teaching. Every word spoken on the subject and every example illustrating it, either in the Old or the New Testament, teaches unequivocally that the preacher must give his undivided time to his ministry and further that those to whom he ministers must provide his temporal support. The preacher or the church wantonly disobeying or thoughtlessly disregarding this reasonable and clearly enunciated Scripture law will come to speedy and irretrievable disaster.

A preacher was talking with a layman whose pastor gave five days in the week to secular employment and two days to his church, and who made much of the fact that he was chargeable to no man in the church for his living. The layman was loud in praise of his pastor's courage in the pulpit, boasting that his pastor was one man who did not shun to declare the whole counsel of God. The preacher said, " Does your pastor ever preach on the text ' Even so did the Lord ordain that they that proclaim the Gospel should live of the Gospel '? " The layman confessed that although he had been a regular church-goer for forty years he had never heard a sermon from that text nor on that subject. The layman in this experience represents the overwhelming majority of church members. Lecturing to a class of more than a hundred preachers recently, I asked how many had ever preached a sermon on this subject of pastoral support. Six hands went up. I then asked how many had ever heard a sermon on the subject. Five hands went up. In view of the almost universal neglect of faithful exposition of the Scriptures on the duty of pastoral support, can we wonder that the churches have so little conscience on the subject? The regenerated man is usually ready to do whatever he is convinced is clearly required by the Word of God. Most of us church-goers never hear anything about pastoral support except when the preacher, goaded to desperation with un-

paid bills, hurls an acrimonious diatribe at our heads because his salary is in arrears. A little more faithful exegesis of God's Word on the subject of pastoral support before the deficit occurred would have prevented the necessity of the censorious philippic after it occurred. Correct views on this matter would revolutionize many of our preachers and most of our churches. Faithful teaching on the subject would prevent the perennial embarrassment, confusion and friction incident to raising the pastor's salary.

Let us give the rest of this discussion to some commonplace suggestions about the preacher and his money.

Consider in the first place his motive in desiring it:

(1) That he may preach without charge. There are three things to be said. (*a*) Such a course would be bad on the churches. In 2 Corinthians 12: 13, Paul refers to the fact that he had not required a support at the hands of that church and begs them to forgive the wrong he had done them. Pastoral support is a means of grace to a church. In not requiring it, the preacher does the church more harm than his preaching will do it good. (*b*) Such a course would be bad on the preacher. It is a matter of common knowledge that when religious institutions, whether church or school, become so richly endowed that they are no longer directly dependent upon the people they lose their

power to serve the people. The same principle holds in the case of the preacher. His power to serve will depend largely upon his consciousness that he is directly dependent upon the people and directly answerable to them. If you say that such a situation would militate against his manly independence, I answer that it would also militate against his devilish pride. (*c*) The further fact is that he will not realize his dream about making money. If God has called him to preach He just will not let him succeed if he turns aside from preaching to make money, however high his motive for making it. The same God who drove all the fish away from Peter's net the night he quit his ministry and went back to his old secular calling will deliberately and persistently thwart every money-making scheme of the preacher who seeks wealth at the expense of his ministry. A friend of my youth became inoculated with this fatuous germ. He was going to make a fortune so he could preach where he pleased without burdening the churches. He went into speculation and seemed to run well for a season. Such was his apparent success that a mutual friend, a conservative business man, assured me that this brilliant young preacher held certain equities that could not fail to make him rich. Within less than ten years he was a financial wreck. The worst of it all was that honour went down in the wreck, so that he could not buy a loaf of bread on credit in the

town where he lived. A third of a century has passed, but he has never been able to extricate himself from the bog into which his foolish disregard of God's word led him. If this statement should come to his notice, let him not accuse me of offensive personalities. I may, so far as he knows, be talking about the other man. For he and I know several others to whom these remarks, in a general way, might be applied. How many fatal examples will the preachers require to convince them that God hath ordained that they who preach the Gospel shall live of the Gospel and not of speculation?

(2) But a second motive the preacher assigns for wanting to make money is that he may be able to give. The first remark on that proposition is that probably he would not give. The general rule is the richer the preacher the less he gives. And a further remark is that there is something so much better that he can give. One right-minded, New Testament-governed, Spirit-filled, soul-loving preacher is worth more than a million dollars to any community. One such preacher sacrificed on the altar of Midas is a more deplorable and irremediable loss than the failure of every bank in a city.

(3) A third motive the preacher sometimes urges for desiring money is that he may live easy. In the first place, money cannot buy ease. Damocles thought King Dionysius had an easy

time and foolishly envied him. Once he was permitted to sit in the King's chair at a banquet. To his consternation, he saw just above his head a heavy sword hung by a single hair. Wealth may not, although it usually does, destroy ease. It certainly cannot produce it. In the second place, easy living is the mother of temptation and is apt to be the death of spirituality. John Wesley spoke a great truth when he said: "I do not fear for Methodism while Methodists are poor and weak. I fear for Methodism when Methodists become rich and strong." In the Bible he was called a fool who said, "Soul, take thine ease." It was a seductive, softly-blowing south wind that paved the way for Paul's shipwreck. The storm is safer for the preacher than the calm sea. David took his ease while his soldiers went to war. Uriah's death and Bathsheba's fall and his own disgrace blossomed noxiously in that soil. The ease-taking preacher is in a bad way for both happiness and usefulness.

In addition to his motive in desiring money, let us consider for a moment his method of making it:

(1) He may save it. A miser was asked how he made his money. He answered, "I did not make it. I saved it." I do not depreciate Benjamin Franklin and his disciples when they insist upon prudence, frugality and economy. The preacher should both teach and practice these thrifty virtues, but a preacher puts a knife to his

throat when he sets his heart on saving money. The people have scant respect for a stingy preacher. Paul was talking specifically to preachers when he said, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." The ideal preacher has not the time to make money nor the heart to save it.

(2) Or he may make it by engaging, along with his ministry, in some legitimate secular business. He is foolish if he tries it. It will take time from his ministry, give him an unsavoury reputation as a preacher and scatter the seeds of the deadly money-lust in his heart. On top of all this, God will smash his business and deny him Holy Spirit power as a preacher. Business entirely legitimate and proper for a layman is deadly hemlock to a preacher. I never knew a preacher trying to make money in secular business who did not tarnish and cripple, if he did not utterly forfeit his ministerial standing.

(3) But, perhaps, he will not engage in business, but will invest a little money in some cleverly advertised get-rich-quick speculation. His name is legion, his folly supreme and his disappointment inevitable. Some years ago a deacon urged his pastor to invest a little money in a fabulous fortune-making gold mine in the far off State of Washington (by the way, these guaranteed, blown-in-the-bottle fortune making investments are usually located at the other end of the continent). The deacon said that a few hundred dollars invested would in five years make the pastor in-

dependently rich. "But," said the pastor, "I have not the money to invest." "Very good," urged the deacon, "I will lend you the money." "But," said the pastor, "I might never be able to pay it back." "All right," urged the deacon, "I will guarantee you against loss. If the enterprise does not succeed you need not pay the money back." It sounded so good to the pastor that he took it under advisement. That night he talked it over with his wife—and the noble woman, blessings on her, said, "Don't do it. Even if you knew it would make you a fortune, I don't want you to do it. Wealth will cripple your ministry and I'd rather have you the right sort of gospel preacher than the richest man in the world." That pastor did not invest; other preachers did. I hope they kissed their money good-bye, for they have never seen it since. Business enterprises that pay such dividends do not need to peddle their stock nor advertise it in the market-place. I would burn it into the heart fiber of every young preacher that he must leave speculation to the stock gamblers while he gives himself wholly "to the ministry of the Word and to prayer."

A fourth way a preacher may get money is to inherit it. In such case he must not throw it away and probably should not give it away all in a lump. Let him, after consultation with some careful business friends, invest it in some safe enterprise where he will have nothing to do with its management

and use the income from it to the glory of God by helping men.

A fifth way in which he may get money is to marry it. Marrying a rich woman is a dangerous experiment for a preacher. It usually costs him both his standing and his power as a preacher. I trust all the poor rich girls will get good husbands, but I pray that few of them may get preachers. It is better for them to marry somebody else—better for them and better for the preachers. A preacher is poorly qualified to manage a rich woman's estate. And managing a rich woman's estate is a piddling business for a preacher. He is called to a bigger business than that. It is true that marriage is a thing of the heart, the consummation of love, and the true man will follow that flag wherever it leads him. But, based on somewhat extensive observation, my advice to the young preacher is: Do not marry a rich woman unless your heart imperiously demands it. In such event make the leap and the Lord have mercy on your soul.

Now that we are on the subject of the preacher and his money, let us think a little about how he shall spend it:

(1) *Judiciously.* Whatever his income may be, there should be no foolish extravagance. He has no right to waste what God gives him. Then, his example in the matter will mean much in the community. The preacher's course in this matter will

set the pace for others. Reckless expenditure of money or the judicious use of it on the part of the people will depend much upon the example the preachers set. Again, he should spend his money judiciously to avoid debt. The preacher goes on the toboggan slide the day he begins to buy beyond his ability to pay. This does not mean that he should never make a debt. But an honest man will never make a debt until he has carefully thought out a plan by which he will be able to pay that debt. A debt contracted with no reasonable prospect of being able to pay it, is not a mere misfortune—it is a disgrace. Such conduct is disreputable everywhere; it is doubly so with the preacher.

(2) *Chivalrously.* What we have been saying does not imply that the preacher is to dole out his money like a miser—groaning with each copper as if it were a ruddy drop of his heart's blood. I never admired Robert Ingersoll—neither personally, nor religiously, nor politically, but I heartily indorse him when he said, "I'd rather be a beggar and spend my money like a king, than be a king and spend my money like a beggar." What is more pusillanimous than a puckered, penurious, picayunish preacher? He will chaffer with the huckster for half an hour to get three more turnips for a dime and haggle with the haberdasher for a nickel's reduction on a pocket handkerchief.

(3) *Religiously.* Paul's "Whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God," applies with peculiar

force to the preacher and his money. The Scripture ideal is that the preacher's money comes to him in return for religious service, and we almost feel that more than other men he is bound to spend it religiously. That does not mean that all his income must be spent on distinctly religious activities, but it does mean that he must not spend a penny for a material necessity or comfort or luxury except as these shall in some way advance Christ's Kingdom. Under this principle, he may spend money for physical necessities, material comforts or even chastened luxuries and healthful amusements. Money spent for intellectual culture or æsthetic enjoyment may easily be justified under this principle. No one can lay down an arbitrary procrustean set of rules, specifying in detail what the preacher may buy or may not buy. Each man must work out for himself the details of how he shall spend his money, keeping always in mind Paul's controlling general principle that whatever he spends must be for the glory of God.

Finally, although it is only indirectly germane to the subject of this lecture, let us say a word about the preacher's attitude to men who have money. Some Lilliputian ministerial specimens are prejudiced against men just because they have money and lend themselves to the unseemly task of arraying the so-called poor against the so-called rich. It was mine to attend not long ago a religious pow-wow (I will not degrade the noble

word by calling it a revival) in which the peripatetic shekel-gathering pulpiteer (I will not dishonour the gracious New Testament title by calling him an evangelist), along with other silly performances, spent much time in bringing foolish and groundless charges against the banks and bankers in the community. Now banks and bankers, like other institutions and other men, are sometimes "unco weak" and often wrong-adjusted, but "banking" and "badness" are not necessarily synonymous. Whatever might be said of individuals in this class, some, perhaps most, of those bankers were high-minded citizens, altruistic humanitarians and reasonably consistent Christians. My eyes not being, as Sam Weller said, "million magnifying microscopes," I was unable to see what good the crass sensationalist hoped to accomplish by arousing community prejudice against a group of men who were, to say the least, equal to the average as citizens and church members. A rich man, like a preacher, may be a bad man, but the argument to prove that he is bad should be based upon some other premise than the incidental and often accidental fact that he is rich. The preaching that arrays class against class is bad medicine. This proposition will hold everywhere. It will apply with equal force to arraying the poor against the rich and the rich against the poor, the white against the black and the black against the white, the old against the young and the young

against the old, the native against the foreigner and the foreigner against the native. Class legislation and class preaching are equally obnoxious to New Testament democracy. The gospel preacher is sent forth to minister unto men—not to a class—but to all men alike. The preacher prostitutes his office when he allows the demagogue's prejudice against wealth to disqualify him for ministering in spiritual things to men who are rich.

But there are preachers who, while they have no prejudice against the rich man, are disqualified for ministering to him because they are afraid of him. They suppose that the rich man is inherently and psychologically different from other men. The preacher is often overawed by the physical blandishments of wealth, "its tinsel, show and a' that, its riband, star and a' that," but when he probes through "a' that" he finds that the rich man loves and hates and laughs and weeps, covets friendship and fellowship, is conscious of his sinfulness, longs to be rid of sin, admits his need of a Saviour and yearns for spiritual instruction, is bad in spots and good in spots, an heir of total depravity and the subject of saving grace—even as others. There is not, from any point of view, as much difference as many people imagine between wealth and poverty. The rich man of to-day will be the poor man of to-morrow and the poor of to-day the rich of to-morrow. There is only an "e" between fasting and feasting. There is no good reason why the

preacher should either despise his rich layman or fear him. They are brothers—brothers in creation, brothers in human frailty, brothers in the new birth. Why should not they understand each other?

> Then let us pray that come it may
> As come it will for a' that
> That sense and worth o'er a' the earth
> May bear the gree, and a' that
> For a' that and a' that
> It's coming yet for a' that
> That man to man the world o'er
> Shall be brothers for a' that."

In addition to these two types—those who are prejudiced against the rich and those who fear the rich—let us think for a moment of the preacher who toadies to the rich. Some preachers, and particularly some preachers' wives, are the victims of a "strong weakness" at this point. Once upon a time, if persistent tradition may be accepted, there was a preacher who, whenever any question came up for decision at church, would always inquire, "Well, what does the church say?" But when he asked the question he would look straight at the pew of the only rich man in the church. Once when the rich man was absent, a humorous, and somewhat critical deacon said, in answer to the pastor's regulation question and habitual involuntary glance at the rich man's pew, "The church is

sick abed with measles." Though he were an angel from heaven, it is bad for a church when one person bears its burdens or dominates its thinking. It is bad if one man dominates by sheer force of strong character and superior ability. It is doubly bad if he dominates it by the superficial and accidental power of money. The preacher who fights men because they have money deserves an earnest rebuke, though he may retain our respect. But the preacher who deliberately fawns upon the rich, places himself utterly beyond the respect of a decent man. Money is a fictitious and dangerous basis of power and authority, either in a local church or a general religious convocation. I am against the money basis test of membership in any kind of religious body, from a local church to an ecumenical council.

A pointed conclusion. If there is truth in the foregoing contention that the preacher should have no other dependence for his support than the proceeds of his ministry, is there not growing out of it an imperious demand that the churches shall be more conscientious in the matter of supplying the money to make it possible for him to live in accordance with this evident Scripture requirement?

VII

SOME QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE OFFICE—PHYSICAL AND MENTAL

"A workman that needeth not to be ashamed."
—2 Timothy 2: 15.

WHEN God wills to make a great preacher His first need is a perfect animal. I do not say His highest need, but His first need—not first, to be sure, in importance but first in process. A good physique is to a preacher what a good foundation is to a house. It is not the whole thing but it is that upon which the whole thing rests.

I. *Physical Qualifications.* A man may make a useful preacher in spite of the handicap of a frail body, but the ideal preacher has a perfect physique. A successful ministry with a diseased, enfeebled body is achieved against great odds. Other things being equal, the vigorous, robust, muscular preacher will distance his frail, feeble, fragile brother. Carlisle, though a confirmed dyspeptic and therefore not in this case the hero of his own story, gave noble advice when he said in an address to students in Edinburg, "Finally, I have one advice which is of very great importance. You are to consider that health is a thing to be attended

to continually as the very highest of all temporal things. There is no kind of an achievement equal to perfect health. What to it are nuggets and millions?" Happy the preacher who can say with old Adam in "As You Like It":

> "Though I look old yet am I strong and lusty
> For in my youth I never did apply
> Hot and rebellious liquors in my blood.
> Nor did not with unbashful forehead woo
> The means of weakness and debility
> Therefore my age is as a lusty winter,
> Frosty but kindly."

Should physical soundness be considered in examining candidates for ordination to the ministry? The question is carefully considered by Boards appointing men to foreign fields. If I will admit that there are good reasons for greater care as to the health of the foreign missionary than that of the home preacher will not my brother who shook his head when I raised the question admit that ordaining councils ought to give at least some consideration to the candidate's physical condition? While admitting that a robust body should not be made a *sine qua non* to ordination, I insist there ought to be at least enough attention given to it to impress the prospective preacher with the importance of preserving his health and developing physical strength.

1. That the preacher should be sound in body

may be established by *an argument from Scripture.*

A very suggestive Scripture is found in Leviticus 21: 21–23: "No man of the seed of Aaron the priest that hath a blemish shall come nigh to offer the offerings of the Lord made by fire. He shall eat the bread of his God both of the most holy and of the holy. Only he shall not go in into the veil nor come nigh unto the altar because he hath a blemish."

Another suggestive Scripture is 1 Corinthians 6: 19: "Or know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you which ye have from God and ye are not your own? Glorify God therefore in your body." The implication is clear that since the body is the temple of the Holy Spirit it must not only be kept clean and pure but must be kept strong.

Another passage on the same point is 3 John 2: "Beloved I pray that thou mayest prosper and be in health even as thy soul prospereth."

But perhaps the best Scripture evidence lies in the fact that the Scriptures afford no instance of God calling to a special task a diseased man, a physically weak man or a man with any abnormal physical peculiarities. The proof is not absolute but the evidence is strong that when in any dispensation covered by the Bible God chose a man for a special task He chose a man physically robust.

2. A strong body is demanded by the *argument from an eminent need.* His pulpit ministrations demand it. I freely confess that some of our preachers when they "exercise in public" make a heavier draft on physical strength than the necessities of the case justify, but even the sane pulpit performance, the kind that does not "tear a passion to tatters" makes a great draft on physical strength. Again, the preacher needs physical strength if he does the amount of pastoral visiting he should. And further, if he is the student he should be he will need a strong body to make possible long continued mental activity. And yet again, if he writes as many sermons as he should and as much for publication as he ought the "drain of the desk" will require a strong body. And still further, if his pastorate is large its demands upon him will be such as to force him into irregular hours and the loss of much sleep. If the preacher makes more speeches than a lawyer, more visits than a doctor, does more studying than a college professor, writes more copy than an editor, loses more sleep and has more irregular hours than a trained nurse, a sound body is not only a great luxury but an imperious necessity. It may also be suggested that the preacher's social influence and therefore, to some extent, his usefulness as a minister will be affected by his physical condition. It is certainly true that the optimistic, conquering spirit without which no preacher can succeed will

depend more perhaps than he thinks upon the state of his health.

Given a good sound body seven things are necessary for its permanent maintenance. (1) Sleep—six to nine hours, depending on temperament and age. (2) Food—properly prepared and in sufficient quantity, thoroughly masticated. (3) Fresh air—out of doors as much as possible night and day, asleep or awake. (4) Clothing—clean and suited to the thermometer. (5) Exercise—a good system of gymnastics twice daily, including much walking. (6) A bath—just before it is needed. (7) Mental recreation, including laugh-provoking amusements, since there is no virtue in a forlorn and funereal physiognomy.

II. *Intellectual Qualifications.* A good brain developed by natural human agencies is an essential factor in the making of a real preacher. Huxley is not often quoted as authority in a theological seminary, but he was thoroughly orthodox when he spoke of "a man so trained in youth that his body is the ready servant of his will and does with equal pleasure all the work that as a mechanism it is capable of—whose intellect is a clear, cold, logic-engine with all its parts ready like a steam engine to be turned to any kind of work and spin the gossamers as well as forge the anchors of the mind." When God foreordains, predestinates and elects a worthy preacher his electing grace always includes a big brain. He is foolish who enters, or tries to

go on in the ministry depending on brains; but he is equally foolish who thinks the Lord will supply the preacher with something as a substitute for brains. John Brown of Haddington used to say: "Gentlemen, ye need three things to make ye good ministers. Ye need learning and grace and common sense. As for the learning I'll try to set ye in the way for it; as for grace ye must always pray for it, but if ye have na' brought the common sense with ye, ye may go about your business."

The saying was once more current than now, but we still hear it said that if the preacher will just open his mouth the Lord will fill it. And He will —with wind. This notion that unpreparedness, fatal everywhere else, would be all right for preaching, got its start from a misinterpretation of 1 Corinthians 1: 23, "Behold your calling, brethren, how that not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called." And yet these words were written by a man of tremendous natural gifts and the broadest culture in the schools of his day. There was never a great preacher who was not a great student. He may have missed college and seminary both, but he was a student. He may not have had your well appointed "study" nor walls lined with costly volumes, nor rich study gown; nor elegant leisure for dawdling over many books, but if he was a great preacher—a useful preacher, he was a great student—a diligent student. A man who had rounded

out his forty years in the ministry said to a friend just the other day, "The only reason why I have failed to make a great and useful preacher is that I have not been a diligent student. I have a good mind, have received the very best educational advantages, have read a multitude of books, and travel has given me rather wide observation, but I have never really studied the books I read nor the situations observed in travel." The brother may have had an exaggerated notion of his ability on the one hand or of the failure of his ministry on the other, but he was emphasizing a great truth. Due to other conditions a man may fail even if he is a student; but whatever the other conditions he is certain to fail, if he is not. In 2 Timothy 2: 2 the "give diligence" of the revision as a substitute for the "study" of the authorized version emphasizes and reinforces my position. Paul exhorts Timothy to give attendance to reading, exhorting and teaching, and then urges him to do two things, (1) Meditate on them. The word is μεγετάω (*megetao*) and was used by the Greeks to express the act of the orator pondering and pruning and practicing his oration and implies far more than the semi-elastic cogitations usually thought of as religious meditation. (2) Live in them. The translation reads "give thyself wholly to them," but the verb used is from ἐιμί (*eimi*) to be, to live, and it says literally "live in these things." This passage teaches that if a man is to be a

preacher he must ponder, prune, practice—immerse his life in the mighty task. No wonder he urges such diligent attention to the three things—reading, doctrine, exhortation—for they cover the whole of the preacher's public ministry. There is the public reading of God's word—how important that it be done intelligently, intelligibly, interpretatively. There is the sane interpretation of the word of God setting forth each doctrine in its place and its season—cutting the cloth straight that the garment of truth may be symmetrical. There is exhortation—the proper practical application of these doctrines to the lives of men. Here is a task large enough to demand of even the most brilliant preacher that he shall literally live in it.

Let us at this point name a few considerations from a purely human standpoint demanding a studious ministry.

(1) *Study leads to humility.* Undigested reading causes a preacher to swell. Study makes him grow. Superficial acquaintance with books and their contents tends to pomposity. Genuine knowledge chastens and humbles. Whoever parades his learning has not got it. He who has learning does not parade it. A great physician said not long since: "One of the sad things about my profession is that my patients think I can do so much for them while I know I can do so little." The most learned professor of my school days said one day to a class of beginners, "Gentlemen, the difference

between what you know and what I know would make a very small book." Among professional men the advertiser is branded a quack. The rule will hold in the entire realm of learning. Humility is the handmaiden of real learning.

(2) *Study gives poise and stability to character and thereby guarantees a longer period of usefulness.* If a man is a student his material will last longer. It is rarely if ever assigned as a reason for making a change but I have no doubt most of the lamentable and much deplored pastoral shifting is due to the fact that most of our preachers are really not students. It is easier to ship the present little box of sermons than it is to fill another box. It is easier to run off to another situation than it is to prayerfully study and solve this one. It is my privilege to know intimately many ministers and it is not the harsh judgment of a cynic but the opinion of a sympathetic friend when I say that fifty per cent. of them have quit studying. Yes, they read some—many of them read much, some of them too much, but they are not students. Every preëminently successful pastorate known to me is filled by a man who is a preëminent student. The listless treadmill pastorate is the legitimate daughter of a lounging, unstudious pastor. Soon, for want of fresh preaching material, he will drift into another, and usually a less important, field. When the preacher loses his grip on his studies he will soon lose his grip on his field.

But not only will the material of the studious preacher last longer but the man himself will last longer. What killed J. M. Gaddy, the great Texas Baptist evangelist and missionary? I speak his name in reverence as one who loved him as Jonathan loved David. But why did he die twenty years before his natural time? Entering the ministry past thirty, with very limited education, his great brain and great heart and great energy thrust him almost immediately into positions alongside of trained, seasoned, educated men. He used to say, "What these educated men can do easily I must do in main strength and awkwardness." The recruit was thrown into line with the trained veteran and died rather than whimper. Given an opportunity for study that would have disciplined and seasoned his wonderful gifts he might be living to-day.

(3) The habit of study saves the preacher from encouraging and becoming involved in petty neighbourhood gossip and jealousy. It is a sad day when the preacher quits studying and goes to gossiping. The one is pretty sure to come in at the door when the other goes out at the window. While his mind is full of the great truths he is constantly discovering in God's word or of great enterprises being planned or wrought out for the kingdom he is practically immune from the toy tempest that may be brewing in the neighbourhood teapot. But if his mind is not occupied with the great main things he will without knowing how it

happened find himself obsessed with trifling, inconsequential neighbourhood peccadilloes. If a preacher will save himself and his people from the blight of frivolous fads, puerile jealousies and petty strifes let him live, and lead his people to live, in the realm of great truths, noble ideals and lofty enterprises. When Paul urged Timothy to "refuse profane and old wives' fables" he meant, to put it in modern English, that the preacher must keep his fingers out of, and his mind off of neighbourhood gossip. The man who plants his seed thought in Lilliput will never reap his deed crop in Brobdingnag. A boy, the owner of bantam chickens, disappointed with the size of their eggs, suspended an ostrich egg in front of their nests on which he had inscribed, "Look at this and do your best." Without knowing it he was illustrating a great psychological principle. Only the devoutly studious preacher can have what Paul called "the heavenly vision" and only such preacher can save himself and his people from the clog of littleness, the surfeit of trivialities, the blight of the puny politicaster. Lowell's "men with empires in their brains" will have neither space nor taste nor talent for street-corner gossip.

III. *Temperamental Qualifications.* Not every healthy, brainy, pious, consecrated man would make a good preacher. With the poet, the artist, the musician, the warrior, the scientist, the mechanic, the farmer, success will be largely a matter

of temperament. Even so with the preacher. This subtle psychological principle is recognized when we speak of the "pastor heart." Let us briefly consider some of these temperamental qualifications peculiar to the preacher.

(1) *Optimism.* The man prone to see the hole and overlook the doughnut has answered some other man's call and is wasting his time in a theological seminary. No amount of training can make a preacher of him. The only hope for him is that his trouble may be symptomatic and not constitutional, for Beecher is right in maintaining that good nature is often a mere matter of health, and I would add that despondency may be due to his being for the time out of touch with God. Every real preacher knows experimentally the truth of the hymn our mothers sang:

> "How tedious and tasteless the hours
> When Jesus no longer I see;
> Sweet prospects, sweet birds and sweet flowers
> Have all lost their sweetness to me.
> The midsummer's sun shines but dim,
> The fields strive in vain to look gay;
> But when I am happy in Him
> December's as pleasant as May."

If he has tried every remedy and finds that dolorous dolefulness is still the burden of his ministry let him give up preaching and try for an undertaker.

(2) *Altruism.* When William Booth determined to send a heartening message to his Salvation Army captains around the world he cabled the one word "Others." The preacher is not to look out for himself but for others. In my early ministry a somewhat self-centered parishioner announced his wish that the pastor would attend to his own business and let other people alone. Certainly the preacher should not be an officious meddler, but the parishioner aforesaid forgot or probably never knew that the pastor's one and only business in life is to look after other people. Altruism is a part of the business of all other callings; it is the whole thing with the preacher. The preacher is sent to "Tend the flock of God, exercising oversight." He is required to "reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and teaching." It is demanded of him that he shall "take heed to all the flock in which the Holy Ghost hath made him an overseer." It is taught in Hebrews 13: 17 that the pastor shall give account to God and not to men for the diligence with which he has watched men in behalf of their souls.

(3) *Sympathy.* The ideal pastor suffers in every sorrow that comes to any of his people and rejoices in every joy of theirs. A blight is on the preacher whose pastoral functions are performed in cold, perfunctory officialism. The preacher's constant temptation is professionalism. The machine-made preacher, scrupulously punctilious in

the details of duty but minus a sympathetic heart, is as chilling and incongruous and gruesome as a skeleton at a marriage feast. Sharing the sorrows of his people is often the bitterest cup the pastor must drink, but it is an essential, infallible, God-appointed source of power. Sympathy is innate but it is a quality susceptible of infinite development. Happy the preacher who guards against the cynicism that would repress it and keeps his heart in an atmosphere conducive to its growth. Honest tears when his people weep and unfeigned joy when his people rejoice will ever be a distinguishing mark of the true pastor.

(4) *Moral Earnestness.* The phlegmatic temperament is good for some callings but it is fatal to the preacher. A cool, calculating, imperturbable man may be worth fifty thousand a year in managing a great business enterprise, but he would not be worth a farthing as a preacher. Our word zeal comes from a verb that means "to boil." Till the water boils there is no steam in the engine, and where there is no steam there is no power. When the preacher's heart ceases to boil his power is gone. It is freely admitted that one of the weaknesses of the average pastorate is a lack of organization and careful planning, but experience abundantly proves that the best calculated plans are fruitless unless they are permeated and interpenetrated with the dynamic of a hot-hearted pastor. In the ancient mythology a fire was kept burning on the

altar of Vesta. From it the sacred fire on every family hearthstone was lighted. It was counted so important that certain virgins were dedicated to the task of seeing that this fire was never extinguished. Is there not a large sense in which the fire of religious enthusiasm and consecration in the homes of his people will depend upon the flame that burns in the preacher's own heart. To the ancients extinguishing the fire on Vesta's altar would have been reckoned an unspeakable calamity. When the fires of moral earnestness no longer burn in the pastor's heart the church is truly in a bad way. Fortunate the church whose pastor can truthfully say with the Psalmist, "My zeal (my heart-boiling) for thine house hath consumed me." Whatever may be permissible in others, with the preacher this must not be an intermittent flame. Whatever others may do, let the preacher summon every vestal virgin of human agency and of divine grace to keep the fires of moral earnestness burning on his heart's altar.

VIII

SOME QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE OFFICE—MORAL AND SPIRITUAL

"The bishop must be blameless."—TITUS 1: 7.

IN the preceding chapter we have discussed the physical, intellectual and temperamental qualifications for the preacher's office. This chapter will be given to a discussion of moral and spiritual qualifications as drawn from Paul's teaching in his letters to Timothy and Titus and in his biography in the book of Acts. In his letters to these two young brethren and in this brief biography he quite clearly delineates the type of man the gospel preacher should be. With these letters and this biography open before us let us see what picture Paul draws of the ideal young preacher in his moral and spiritual nature.

1. *He is one who will not run from a difficult field.* Most of our lamentably frequent pastoral changes are due to the fact that the preacher is unwilling to go up against a hard situation. In the language of the gridiron, "He won't buck the line." Timothy was pastor at Ephesus. The church was infected with heresy and infested with heretics. The young preacher was ready to quit, but Paul exhorted him to tarry at Ephesus (1 Tim.

1: 3). He did, and it made a man of him. My dear young brother, if you are up against a hard situation on your field, don't run away from it. You will never recover from the moral degeneration such a course would produce. In 1 Corinthians 16: 9 Paul is writing from this same hard field at Ephesus and gives its difficulties as one of his reasons for staying there. Nothing is more humiliating than the fact that among the preachers so many of us are unwilling to endure hardship. Desiring to be clothed in soft raiment, we become a reed shaken by the wind. When Paul talked about his hard field he said he would tarry at Ephesus till Pentecost. Stay and suffer on your hard field, my young brother, and before you know it Pentecost will come. Yours is a hard field, and so are all the others. Don't quit. Tarry at Ephesus.

In 2 Timothy 2: 3 the young preacher is exhorted to take his part in suffering hardship as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. Nothing threatens Christianity's prestige more than the unwillingness of its disciples to suffer for it. If the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church, seed corn is not over abundant in the twentieth century. Ease-loving, self-seeking ambitious disciples have been the outstanding menace of Christianity from the day of its Founder until now. John the Baptist was willing to decrease that his Master might increase. Was he an exception then? Is the spirit he showed an exception now? One is a little in-

clined to think so if he is, as some of us are, in a position to see the loudest professions of the sacrificial spirit attended with constant scheming for soft places of ease and honour. But let us not grow pessimistic, though we thus speak. All about us are glorious gospel preachers, many of them, yea most of them, silent and unobtrusive and obscure, who for the little good that they may do in their unnoticed corners are living a martyr's life and are ready to die a martyr's death. A man may find selfishness and the love of ease and pleasure among preachers if he looks for it, but, thank God, an equally diligent search will reveal to him the other spirit also. The arbitrary self-mortifications and voluntary macerations of the dark ages disgust us, but the truth remains that the preacher's best credential of a call to preach is his willingness to suffer that he may preach.

2. *He is one who is always on the right side.* When Paul said, "I have fought the good fight," he was not praising himself for the way he fought but he was praising the side he fought on—not good fighting but a good fight. Nothing is more discouraging than a vacillating preacher,

> "Standing first on one foot, then on t'other.
> On which foot he feels the worst he could not tell you nother."

Nothing is more satisfying than to have a preacher of whom one is sure that he will always

be found on the right side. A brilliant woman discussing a prospective pastor, was informed that while he had been wrong in doctrine he had come right. She answered at once, "I don't want a pastor who had to come right. I want one who has always been right." Some of us, perhaps all of us, rejoice that there is a chance for John Mark to come right even after he has gone wrong. But John Mark limping back from error in doctrine or lapse in character will never regain power and prestige lost while training on the wrong side. In the Southern Baptist Convention there are two men, brilliant, genial and, so far as I know, honourable, whose usefulness has been practically ruined by a fatal penchant for getting on the wrong side of every denominational question. They are fearless, chivalrous fighters, but they usually fight on the wrong side. Practical application of David Crockett's motto, "Be sure you are right; then go ahead," would have saved some preachers of my acquaintance from making shipwreck of life. To the young preacher it is of vital importance that his career shall be started right—not only in doctrine and character but in coöperation, alignment, comradeship. A man's value to society will depend more upon the side he chooses to fight on than upon the character of fight he makes. What a benediction it brings to a young preacher when he discovers himself vitally linked with a great movement or closely bound in comradeship with a

noble man! All the knighthood of noble youth guarantees that you will make a gallant fight. But quiet those noble but tumultuous impulses for a moment before sword is drawn or gauntlet thrown. Let us be sure, quite sure, that we are fighting on the right side.

3. *He is one who respects constituted authority.* Paul speaks of him as one who is subject to rulers, to authority, no striker, no brawler. If human law forbids what God's law requires or requires what God's law forbids the Christian is not only not bound to keep it but is bound to break it. Peter set the pace for every preacher, and indeed for every Christian, when he said, "We must obey God rather than men." If the government passes a law that forbids preaching the preacher is bound to violate that law, even at the cost of his life. But if a city, to prevent congestion of traffic, forbids public assemblies of any kind in certain narrow busy streets, the preacher blunders in the application of this principle when he insists on preaching there. If the law, civil or domestic, forbids administering the ordinance of baptism, the preacher is bound to break it, but when a preacher takes a ten-year-old child out of the atmosphere of an emotional revival meeting and baptizes it contrary to the will of its parents, he has blundered and caused the child to blunder in the application of this principle. The Scriptures require that Christian people shall not forsake the assembling of themselves

together and the preacher is not blameless if he fails to urge obedience to the injunction. But if, to prevent the spread of disease, a city passes a law forbidding public gatherings for a season, the preacher who insists on gathering his crowd in the face of that law blunders in the application of our principle. If God's law requires that a thing be done now and here and thus, the preacher has no alternative. But it is not difficult to see how the words "now" and "here" and "thus" will help in applying God's law to practical life.

4. *He is one whose every relation is marked with courtesy and propriety.* "Do not upbraid an elderly man, but exhort him as a father, the elderly women as mothers, the younger women as sisters, in all purity. Honour those widows who are really widows" (1 Tim. 5: 1). Courtesy is the mark of a gentleman. It is inherent with a real gentleman, but like every innate quality, it may be either retarded or developed. His becoming demeanour toward those in different stations about him is a prophecy of the young preacher's career. Far too little does the average preacher estimate the value of these social amenities. Courtesy costs less and pays a larger dividend than any other human investment. Some of us have been so anxious to be candid that we have sometimes forgotten to be courteous. *Suaviter in modo* is by no means incompatible with *fortiter in re.* Courtesy is indigenous to a kind heart. If found elsewhere it is

an exotic. The real thing is spontaneous and unstudied. Given a kind heart and it does not need to be forced, but "droppeth like the gentle rain from heaven upon the place beneath. It is twice blessed; it blesseth him that gives and him that takes. It is mightiest in the mightiest." The preacher shows to the best advantage when courtesy seasons sincerity. Truth will win its way quickest where courtesy is the handmaiden of orthodoxy.

Especially would I speak a word about the young minister's attitude toward old preachers—the veterans of the cross. Paul exhorts Timothy (2 Tim. 1: 8), "Be not ashamed of the testimony of the Lord nor of me his prisoner," and a little later he says, "Come to me shortly," and still further, "The cloak which I left at Troas bring when thou comest and the books and especially the parchments." In these verses Paul paid a high compliment to Timothy. Had Paul thought of Timothy as a self-seeking, carnally minded, professional theologue he would have known that it was useless to count on any consideration from him. That sort of young preacher would have said, "The old fire eater has gotten himself into trouble by always preaching doctrinal sermons and not knowing when or where nor how to preach. He need not think I am going to waste my time carrying him a lot of luggage. I am too busy finishing my thesis on the World Problem of Home

Rule in Kalahari Desert to waste any of it on a worn-out old theological controversialist. If he had been discreet he would not have been in all this mess anyway." But Paul knew Timothy—that he was not cut out according to that pattern. He knew Timothy would say, "This unusual request comes at my busiest time, but here is a veteran of the cross who for a third of a century has fought the battles of my people. He is perhaps out of the running now but out of reverence for his noble life and out of gratitude for his sacrificial achievements I shall do my best for the comfort of his last days." The young preacher's attitude toward the veteran and pioneer of the cross is an accurate index of his character. In the palmiest days of B. H. Carroll's brilliant career there occasionally drove to his gate in a rickety old buggy, R. S. Hurt, a veteran frontier missionary. Unlettered and poorly clad and tottering with age, he was always an honour-guest. I have seen the knightly younger preacher slip the old man's rough shoes out of his room at night and polish them while he slept—thus fulfilling in spirit the Master's command to wash one another's feet and thus also fulfilling the spirit of Paul's exhortation when he begged Timothy not to be ashamed of him—the aged veteran of the cross.

But Paul especially warns the young preacher touching his relation to younger women (1 Tim. 5: 2). This warning, of course, includes those grosser immoralities to which the young preacher

is perhaps often tempted, and before which he sometimes falls. What a tragedy if a young preacher's attitude toward women is such as to raise even a suspicion of the purity of his motives or the cleanness of his life! But I think Paul has in mind particularly the violation of social proprieties rather than the falling into grosser sin. He is perhaps warning against silliness more than against sin. A preacher can easily wreck his influence by a foolish attitude toward women, even when nobody suspects sin either in act or intent. A young preacher holding a rather important denominational position dropped in not long since on the pastorate of a friend of mine and in one day proposed marriage to three separate young ladies, begging each one to get on her knees with him and pray that God would show His will in the matter. When the young ladies compared notes the next day each "let the cat out of the wallet" and the young man's opportunity to serve any good cause in that community suddenly and permanently terminated. The people may forgive a sinner, but it is hard to get them to forgive a fool. It sometimes seems that when a young preacher turns foolish he can be foolish in more ways than any man in the world. When Paul said, "Let no man despise thy youth," he meant that the young preacher must be so circumspect in conduct that he would not by youthful folly give any occasion for contemptuous judgments.

5. *He is one who is concerned about the doctrines of his people.* Paul urged Timothy to remain in Ephesus, not to finish the well-equipped meeting house, nor to round out a large collection for missions, nor to carry a class through a course in teacher training, but to correct certain false doctrines that had crept in (1 Tim. 1: 3). If our fathers erred in the overemphasis of doctrine to the neglect and hurt of altruism and methods, have we not gone wrong at the other extreme in laying emphasis on altruism and methods to the almost total neglect of the systematic house-to-house, personal, pastoral teaching of our doctrines? To a sensitive nature nothing is more humiliating and to a thoughtful man nothing more alarming than the indifferent attitude many of our young pastors assume toward the matter of indoctrinating their people. The spirit of these lectures responds heartily to the modern emphasis on altruism and the modern search for better methods in doing our work. But I tremble for the day when we shall have kind hearts that shall long to carry a blessing to others and splendid methods of carrying this blessing and discover at last that we have nothing to carry. What is the use of a kind-hearted crew and a well-equipped vessel, if we have nothing worth while to put on it? May every modern Timothy hear Paul's exhortation "Take heed to thyself and thy teaching." According to Paul's opinion, therefore, the value of a man's ministry will depend

both upon what he is and upon what he teaches. Strong men cannot be grown by the gush of altruistic sentimentalities nor by rhapsodies about so-called scientific methods of doing church work. Stalwart Christian character—the kind that will suffer for a cause and rejoice in it—can be produced only under the influence of strong doctrinal teaching. Clark in his Northampton Antiquities tells us "That during the history of that town it sent out 114 lawyers, 112 ministers, 95 physicians, 100 educators, 7 college presidents, 30 professors, 24 editors, 6 historians, 14 authors, including George Bancroft, John Lathrop, Motley, Professor Whitney and J. G. Holland, 38 officers of state, 28 officers of the United States, including members of the Senate and one President." I cannot but believe that there is vital relation between the facts cited from Mr. Clark and the further fact, which he does not mention, that Jonathan Edwards, the stalwart and sometimes grim doctrinal preacher, was pastor in that town for nearly a quarter of a century. Did the doctrinal preaching of Jonathan Edwards have any part in the making of these men? I believe it did.

A friend of mine said recently that in the Texas church where he grew up they never had a prayer-meeting, but that what was called the prayer-meeting was really a debating society where a few preachers, members of the church, studied and argued great doctrines of the Bible. He was deplor-

ing that his boyhood church life should have been spent in that atmosphere. No doubt it had its faults but at that particular time there were three boys who were required to attend that prayer-meeting debating society. One of them is now one of the most brilliant and useful pastors in the Southwest; another is one of the most successful and spiritually intelligent laymen in the entire country, and the other is president of one of the largest theological seminaries in America and is especially famous for the perspicuity with which he can state a spiritual truth. Is there any relation between the recognized stalwart character of these three men and the big doctrines with which they were compelled to wrestle when they were boys? To my thinking there is but one answer. It is a great thing when a trained, altruistic, courteous young preacher determines that he will dedicate these qualities to doctrinal preaching. Preach your doctrines, preach them in the right spirit to be sure, but preach your doctrines.

6. *He is one who puts character at a premium—who would rather be than seem.* In 2 Timothy 2: 15 he is exhorted to give diligence that he may present himself *acceptable unto God.* If a man says he does not care for his reputation so his character is all right he is very foolish. If he says it does not matter what men think of him so he is all right with God he is positively silly. Every right-thinking man does care what other men think of

him. Paul required, in Romans 12: 17, that we take thought for things honourable *in the sight of all men.* Every good man is concerned for the good opinion of his fellow-men, but no right-thinking man will put the approval of men above the approval of God—reputation above character. The largest of the preacher's assets is character. That which counts most is not what he says nor what he does nor what he knows, nor what he has but what he is. The Greeks were wont to say "Phocion's character is more than the constitution." On his death-bed Horace Greeley said, "Fame is a vapour, popularity an accident, riches take wings; those who cheer to-day will curse to-morrow; only one thing endures—character." The one all inclusive word to describe the moral qualifications of the preacher is—character. The greatest fact in this world is not an event—a battle, an earthquake, a birth, a death; the greatest fact in this world is a person. The greatest thing in a person is his character. Character is more than the acquisition of facts; more than brilliant achievements; more than delivering the goods; more than winning the game; more than self-control; more than obedience to precepts and prohibitions. Character is the inner gold that gives real value to human life. It is a sad day for us when a church or a pulpit committee shows little concern for a man's character so long as he is able to bring things to pass—to deliver the goods.

The ideal young preacher is also one who would rather be than have. Paul warns us that there are those who adopt godliness as a way of gain (1 Tim. 6: 5), thus subordinating character to the mere matter of getting money. His words on the preëminence of character above mere possession are so cogent and so pertinent and so much needed in this day, threatening as it does the commercializing of the entire thinking of the ministry, that I wish to set them out in special prominence and beg every young preacher to heed the timely truth they contain.

"But godliness with contentment is great gain: for we brought nothing into the world, for neither can we carry anything out; but having food and covering we shall be therewith content. But they that are minded to be rich fall into a temptation and a snare and many foolish and hurtful lusts, such as drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil: which some reaching after have been led astray from the faith, and have pierced themselves through with many sorrows. But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness. Fight the good fight of the faith, lay hold on the life eternal, thereunto thou wast called, and didst confess the good confession in the sight of many witnesses. I charge thee in the sight of God, who giveth life to all things, and of Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed the good confession; that thou keep the commandment, with-

out spot, without reproach, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ."—1 TIMOTHY 6:6–14.

There are many fools in the world but the most consummate fool that walks is the preacher who will deliberately choose to have something of this world's goods rather than being something in God's sight.

7. Another high moral quality of the ideal young preacher is that he knows how to profit by wholesome example. As if he confidently expected his protégé to profit by it, Paul reminds Timothy of his own example. In 2 Timothy 3: 10–11 he says: "But thou didst follow my teaching, conduct, purpose, faith, longsuffering, love, patience, persecutions, sufferings; what things befell me at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra; what persecutions I endured: and out of them all the Lord delivered me." No doubt Timothy's noble heart had been often aroused to high ambitions and sacrificial deeds by dwelling affectionately upon the zealous and unselfish service rendered by his venerable friend and patron. If a young preacher can read, for example, the thrilling story of Z. N. Morill's life and labours in Texas, or as for that the story of any of our pioneers either on home or foreign fields, and not find himself under the example of their heroic souls, longing for a more unselfishly zealous life, he ought to give up the ministry. The man whose soul does not respond to such lofty

examples of devoted service ought not to be a preacher. He is temperamentally qualified for no position higher than a street sweeper. He may be a good man and may do honest commendable work as a street sweeper, but he has not the verve, the vivacity of imagination, the instinctive reverence for high and noble things to make a preacher. Nothing is more pitiable than the young preacher who has allowed himself to believe that the fathers did not know much and could not do much—and who has brought himself to discount in his thinking the past achievements and the present potentialities of the old men in his circle of acquaintance.

Some years ago a group of us were guests in a home during the session of the Simmons College Winter Bible School. The conversation turned to the session of the Southern Baptist Convention at Waco in 1883. Some one said to me, "Did you hear J. R. Graves' wonderful sermon at the Methodist Church during that session?" On receiving an affirmative reply he continued, "Did not you think it was the most wonderful sermon you ever heard?" To which I replied, "To tell you the truth, I had such a bad case of the 'big head' about that time that I could not give an old man much credit for anything he did." At this juncture the venerable grandmother in the home turning to me said, "Did you say you had the 'big head'?" On my admitting that she had correctly interpreted my language she said: "And what did you have to

have the 'big head' about?" I answered quite frankly, "Nothing, sister, nothing on earth; but that is the sort that always has it." Happy the young man who can live long enough to recover at least measurably from such self-inflation and who can be brought to that state of mind where he is able to learn from the example of men of the previous generation.

8. *He is one who gives no room for scandalous talk about himself.* In 1 Timothy 3: 7 it is required "He must have a good report of them that are without lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil." In 2 Timothy 2: 15 he is commanded "Give diligence to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed," and in 1 Timothy 4: 11 he is told "Let no man despise thy youth, but be thou an example of the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity." In 2 Timothy 2: 22 the young preacher is required to "Flee youthful lusts but follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart."

All this and much more of the same import is said in Scripture because it is so vitally important that the preacher should be a man with clean hands and an unsullied name. Every holy cause bleeds and every noble enterprise languishes where the preachers are men of doubtful character. Let the preacher give well-founded occasion for a breath

of scandal connected with his name and he has given the cause of Christ a wound for which he can never atone. How fortunate the minister who through his whole life has so avoided evil, and even the appearance of evil, that there has never been a breath of scandal connected with his name.

9. *He will be a diligent student of the word of God.* Other books he may know, but the word of God he must know if he is to preach with power. The Bible, and not books about the Bible, must be his chief text-book. Most of my life has been spent in some connection with educational institutions for the training of preachers. Without the slightest reservation I believe in them. But that education that dethrones the Bible as the source of religious information, as the vehicle of God's will and as the ultimate authority in religion is a blast, a blight, a mildew in the life of the preacher.

The last address that Dr. John A. Broadus ever made to his students was about Apollos, where it is said of him that he was "mighty in the Scriptures." In this last address, his swan song, this man of many books, this man familiar with the world's literature as few men have been, with a pathos, a fervour and an evident sincerity that no man who heard him will ever forget, insisted that the Bible must be the preacher's preëminent book. To the preacher, if other books shine as the stars, the Bible must blaze as the sun.

What higher encomium could the Holy Spirit

give a man than to say of him that he is "Mighty in the Scripture"? What price would be too great to pay that the preacher might become "Mighty in the Scripture"? What increased stability, efficiency and spiritual joy would come to our churches if it could be truthfully said of them all that their pastors were men "Mighty in the Scriptures"?

10. *He is one who exalts prayer, practices the prayer habit, and lives the prayer life.* Deacons were ordained that the preachers might give themselves more continuously to prayer. Praying is the preacher's chief business. Once I thought otherwise, but experience and a further study of God's word leads me to say with triple underscoring:

Praying is the preacher's chief business.

It is chief because without its illuminating and fructifying and vivifying power all his other activities are stale, vapid, mechanical, professional, unprofitable.

Shall we give a little space to a study of Paul, the prince of preachers, in his estimate of prayer?

(1) Let us look first at his habit in the matter of the personal practice of prayer, as set forth in his fragmentary biography in the book of Acts. Here it will be found that with him prayer was not only a recognized duty but a fixed habit.

(*a*) He seems to have started right, for the first record we have of him after his marvellous con-

version is where the Lord said to Ananias, "Arise and go to the street which is called Straight and inquire for one named Paul, a man of Tarsus; for behold he prayeth." I wonder if a difference at the beginning in the habit of prayer may not, more than we have thought, account for the difference in the start young preachers make. In my hearing a preacher recently said: "Looking back over my own life, I recall young men who entered the ministry with me with gifts confessedly inferior to my own and with far less training. But their ministry was abundantly fruitful from the beginning, while mine in those first years was comparatively barren. I find myself wondering with regret amounting almost to remorse if the difference does not lie in the fact that in the matter of praying they got started right and I did not." That may not tell the whole story, but there is no doubt that the multitudes of comparatively fruitless preachers may be explained in part at least by the fact that these men have led a comparatively prayerless life. Blessed indeed is the preacher who in the beginning of his career found this secret of a happy, triumphant, successful ministry.

(*b*) But if we take a further look we shall see that Paul was in the habit of praying in times of great danger and distress. In the sixteenth chapter of Acts, he was in jail, in the dark cell, with his feet in stocks, his garments sticking to his body with the blood of his unwashed wounds and every

prospect of a speedy death. But we are told that about midnight he and Silas "were praying and singing hymns unto God." When weaker men would have been whining and bemoaning the hardships of the ministry, this valiant soul betook himself to prayer and praise. No wonder God opened for him both a way of escape from danger and an opportunity to bring the greatest blessing to his persecutor.

(*c*) Again we find him reënforcing himself with prayer in a time of heart-breaking farewells. In his farewell to the saints at Ephesus he said: "And now behold I know that ye all among whom I went about preaching the kingdom shall see my face no more." The record continues "and when he had thus spoken he kneeled down and prayed with them all." Paul had all the instincts of a gentleman. He loved his friends and grieved as only a sensitive man can when he must separate from them. He was a loyal patriot and was doubtless heart-stricken when he must say good-bye to his kinsmen according to the flesh to become a minister to an alien people. He doubtless had the home-loving and home-making instinct even as others, but for Christ's sake he never knew the joy of a home. His life was peculiarly made up of farewells to the things and the people he held dearest. The one thing that made this nomadic homeless life bearable was the atmosphere of prayer in which he lived and moved everywhere.

(*d*) But by a further look into his biography we find prayer opening to him constantly enlarging visions of usefulness. Acts 22: 17–21 reads: "And it came to pass, that, when I had returned to Jerusalem, and while I prayed in the temple, I fell into a trance, and saw him saying unto me, Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem; because they will not receive of thy testimony concerning me. And I said, Lord, they themselves know that I imprisoned and beat in every synagogue them that believed on thee: and when the blood of Stephen thy witness was shed, I also was standing by, and consenting, and keeping the garments of them that slew him. And he said unto me, Depart: for I will send thee forth far hence unto the Gentiles." Does any one, reading this record, doubt that there was a direct relation, even the relation of cause and effect, between Paul's prayer on this occasion and his vision of world-ministry?

(*e*) Again we find him falling back upon prayer as a place of refuge and a source of power in a time of physical distress. When he was shipwrecked on the Island of Melita he found the father of its chief citizen sick with fever and dysentery. The record tells us that Paul "entered in and prayed and laid his hands on him and healed him."

(2) But having thus seen something of his habit of prayer in his daily living let us consider his

habit of thought about prayer as reflected in his letters in which he envelopes his friends in the atmosphere of prayer. In Philippians 1: 3–4 he says: "I thank my God for every remembrance of you, always in every prayer of mine, for you all making request with joy." It must have been a joy to these Philippian brethren to know that this good man prayed for them every time he thought of them. In this statement concerning himself Paul incidentally and unconsciously revealed himself as one whose very thinking is in the language of prayer. We find him also praying ceaselessly for the growth and usefulness of his friends. To the Colossians (1: 9–12) he reveals the habit of his thinking when he says: "For this cause we also, since the day we heard it, do not cease to pray and make request for you, that ye may be filled with the knowledge of his will in all spiritual wisdom and understanding, to walk worthily of the Lord unto all pleasing, bearing fruit in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God; strengthened with all power, according to the might of his glory, unto all patience and longsuffering with joy; giving thanks unto the Father, who made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light."

Again we find him unconsciously revealing his prayer habit in thanking God for the fine spirit and good work of his friends. In 1 Thessalonians 1: 2–3 he says: "We give thanks to God always

for you all, making mention of you in our prayers; remembering without ceasing your work of faith and labour of love and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, before our God and Father."

Without a word of apology or a shadow of reservation he confidently attributes his recovery from an apparently fatal illness to the prayers of his brethren. In 2 Corinthians 1: 9–11 he writes: "For we would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning our affliction which befell us in Asia, that we were weighed down exceedingly, beyond our power, insomuch that we despaired even of life: yea, we ourselves have had the sentence of death within ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God who raiseth the dead: who delivered us out of so great a death, and will deliver: on whom we have set our hope that he will also still deliver us; ye will also helping together on our behalf by your supplication; that for the gift bestowed upon us by means of many, thanks may be given by many persons on our behalf."

With the unquestioning simplicity of a child he credits his deliverance from persecutions to the prayers of the good Philippian Church. Philippians 1: 15–19: "Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife; and some also of good will: the one do it of love, knowing that I am set for the defence of the Gospel; but the other proclaim Christ of faction, not sincerely, thinking to raise up affliction for me in my bonds. What then?

only that in every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is proclaimed; and therein I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice. For I know that this shall turn out to my salvation, through your supplication and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ."

He predicates the opening of doors of usefulness and the power to preach successfully upon the prayers of God's people. In Colossians 4: 2–4 he exhorts: "Continue stedfastly in prayer, watching therein with thanksgiving; withal praying for us also, that God may open unto us a door for the word, to speak the mystery of Christ, for which I am also in bonds; that I may make it manifest, as I ought to speak."

He shows his faith in the doctrine of a prayer covenant when he prays for a church and begs the church to pray for him. He writes in 1 Thessalonians 5: 23–25: "And the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Faithful is he that calleth you, who will also do it. Brethren, pray for us."

To him praying for God's blessing upon his brethren is an exercise so real and intense that it is like the anguish of a mother in travail. In Galatians 4: 19 he says: "My little children of whom I am again in travail until Christ be found in you."

The young preacher in his many burdens and perplexities was not forgotten. He also came in

for his share of this mighty man's intercession. We find him writing to Timothy: "How unceasing is my remembrance of thee in my supplications night and day!"

These illustrations taken almost at random will be sufficient to show the preëminent place Paul gave to prayer. He puts prayer at the top when he declares to Timothy that every creation of God is sanctified by prayer.

If this extraordinary preacher, this preacher of such unusual natural gifts and such wide cultural equipment made so much of prayer and counted it a thing so vital in his ministry, how foolish, how blind is the man who writes these lines or the man who reads them if we vainly seek to prosecute our ministry without it.

Whatever else we do God help us to pray. Whatever else we may fail to do, God forbid that we shall fail to pray. With our hearts turning to those to whom the Lord has sent us to minister—let us say with Samuel of old, "Moreover as for me, far be it from me that I should sin against Jehovah in ceasing to pray for you."

IX

SOME MODERN DEMANDS OF THE OFFICE

"Be instant in season, out of season."
—2 TIMOTHY 4: 2.

THE divine authority for this office, the direct call into it and the general, basic duties of it have not changed and will never change. But while the constitutional basis and the generic duties have always been the same, certain specific tasks have arisen in response to the demand of an ever-changing social mind. There were things that the pastor was obligated to do a century ago that he need not do now. And there are things that he was in no sense obligated to do or expected to do a century ago that he must do now. The republican form of government constitutionally guaranteed to the United States has never been changed, but the duties of George Washington and Woodrow Wilson as Presidents under that Constitution, while identical in principle, are very different in detail. Just so pastoral duties of to-day, while the same in principle, are very different in detail from those of yesterday. Washington's problems, while not as manifold nor as universal, were as difficult, as grave and as far-

reaching as Wilson's. We should be foolish to despise Washington because he never saw a train nor any of the inventions between a train and an aeroplane. But we should be more foolish if we demanded that Wilson should abandon his telephone and electric lights in order to be a president just like Washington. In this mechanical effort to make them alike we make them unlike. The only way Wilson can be like Washington is not to do the things that Washington did in the way he did them. They are each to approach his office and its duties in the same high altruistic patriotic spirit, but in very different ways. The quality of the Latin proverb "The times change and we change with them" will depend upon the type of man using it. The pessimist contends that if the preacher changes with the times he is forsaking the old paths and denying the old-time religion. The optimist will contend that if the preacher does not change with the times he must walk to his appointments or ride a donkey. The controversy, like most controversies, grows out of the fact that the men are using the same terms to express different ideas. The pessimist is talking about basic, fundamental, constitutional principles and is right when he maintains that the preacher who changes these or his attitude to them does it at his peril. The optimist is talking about the application of these principles to practical life and is right in claiming that each new generation may and should

require a change in the application of unchanging principles.

New twentieth century conditions are making new demands upon pastoral efficiency. The pastor who shuts his eyes to these modern demands or who fails to equip himself to meet them will soon find himself as much a misfit as a square peg in a round hole. Colleges and seminaries that fail to recognize these new demands and equip men for them will be speedily and automatically and mercilessly relegated to the scrap-heap of innocuous desuetude. And the preacher who despises these new demands is headed for the same goal. What are some of the imperious demands that modern atmospheres are making upon the preacher?

I. *The preacher shall exercise a controlling influence in the modern religious education movement.* Religious education in the public schools is impracticable. There is a tragic neglect of it and a consequent pitiable lack of qualification for it in the home. The Sunday school is seeking to supplement this lack but in most cases its inefficiency is pathetic. Meantime thoughtful men in our churches are awakening to the fact that there is a new science of education. Even the children contrast the efficient public school with the slipshod Sunday school. This consciousness of the inefficiency of the modern Sunday school and its failure to meet the ideals of modern education gave birth to the contemptuous conundrum " When is a school

not a school?—When it is a Sunday school." For two decades, however, there has been in the atmosphere a growing demand that our Sunday schools and our church life generally shall feel the beneficent influence of this new educational science. Out of this effort to apply to religious instruction the modern scientific educational principles has leaped the new Minerva—Religious Education. Universities and Theological Seminaries are paying homage at this shrine. The leading institutions have permanently established and fully equipped Departments of Religious Education. The presses are groaning with books and the magazines teeming with articles on the subject. The Religious Education Association has been organized with its large annual gatherings, its paid secretary and its wide propaganda through books and periodicals.

All of this means that the church has come upon a new day in the manner of getting her God-given old-time message out to the people. It means that the preacher while proclaiming the same old gospel story must remodel some of his methods if he is to take a worthy part in the activities of that new day. The day is gone when by an emotional or an eloquent sermon the preacher has discharged his obligations in the matter of public ministrations in the house of God. The preacher who is to do his best in this generation must know the principles of modern pedagogy. He must be

qualified to train and organize a teaching force in his church. He must be familiar with the scientific principle underlying education. He must be as much at home in this sphere as is the superintendent of the public schools in the community. His knowledge here must be so thorough and accurate that he shall be able to project his ideals into others who shall become his capable helpers in the great teaching business of the church.

The preacher who can enter the average Sunday school without a shudder, on account of its utter lack of efficiency, either has not a sensitive nature or is ignorant of the true science of education. It is easy for the superficial ease-loving preacher to shrug his shoulder and say that this is all a new-fangled business and that the old-fashioned way is good enough for him, and imagine that in saying it he is both pious and orthodox.

And that leads me to say that if we are to preserve the precious heritage of old-time orthodoxy the modern orthodox preacher must make himself the master of the new education as applied to religion. What is the danger of this new movement called religious education? The tendency to substitute culture for Christ—training for regeneration. One of its leading exponents said in a recent book "the best redemption is prevention." That sounds nice but it is not true. Now what are we theological conservatives and orthodox religionists to do about this new scientific education move-

ment and its application to the religious side of man's life? We can ignore it and laugh at it and sniff at it and fuss at it and storm at it, while the radicals take it over into their camp and by it spread the heresy of salvation by character, redemption by prevention, eternal life by development, etc., etc. Or we can load this new scientific education wagon with our orthodox wares and make it deliver the goods for us. Many of our preachers and Sunday-school teachers do not know the meaning of the word pedagogy or psychology and most of them never read a book on either subject. This is far from implying that they can do no good as teachers and preachers. It simply means that they cannot do their best. Ignorance of modern pedagogy and psychology does not disqualify the preacher or teacher but it does greatly discount him. This new religious education is not a doctrine but a method of conveying a doctrine. Shipment of the Bible on an ox wagon or an express train does not affect its doctrines. These are methods of distributing the Bible. So the new Religious Education is not a doctrine but a method, and I think an improved method, of conveying ideas. My concern is that we shall use it as a means of conveying and impressing truth and not turn it over to theological highbrows as a vehicle of false doctrine. It is encouraging to notice the increasing attention being given to this subject by leaders in the various denominations. Practically

all of them are sending out specially prepared men to train Sunday-school workers. Every Methodist presiding elder is urged "to make himself familiar with the modern Sunday school and so be able to inspire his pastors." The presidents of both our Theological Seminaries showed their customary alertness to the demands of a situation when they arranged for a chair of Religious Pedagogy and a well-equipped man to hold Sunday-school training institutes in connection with evangelistic meetings. A revival atmosphere where souls are being saved, and where the conscience of the church is aroused is a hopeful field for religious education. Such evangelism will give no room for the complaint that evangelists arouse but do not develop a church. Religious education is beginning to bulk large in the program of our churches. Dr. Frederick Lynch is right in saying "Soon the church is going to take much of the money it is now spending on quartette choirs and other things and put it where it will do infinitely more good for the kingdom of God—*on the thorough religious education of its children.*"

All this leads to the inevitable conclusion that the twentieth century pastorate demands that its incumbent shall be familiar with the principles of modern scientific education and shall know how to use them.

II. *Another modern condition that makes special demand upon the skill of the preacher is the*

widespread interest in the doctrine of financial stewardship. Whether one holds to the pessimistic theory of the world's degeneration or to the optimistic theory of its upward evolution, it cannot be denied that religion is eliciting more and larger financial gifts than ever in history. It is also true that the church on account of its multitudinous activities is requiring more money than ever before. It follows inevitably that the modern pastor, more than any of his predecessors, faces the problem of securing and directing money for kingdom use. Pastors, particularly in the larger churches, are lamenting the fact that they are about to degenerate into financial agents and business managers. Raising money for religious purposes is a noble undertaking, but many of our best preachers are consciously handicapped by it. Local requirements and outside denominational demands are such that the pastor is hardly out of one strenuous drive before he must enter another. Every true pastor wants to do right by every worthy cause and yet every true pastor has felt that the frequent repetition of high pressure campaigns for money makes against normal, sustained growth in the grace of liberality and incidentally hinders growth along other lines. Nearly every conscientious pastor has felt that there must be some way of raising money for kingdom enterprises better than the one he is using, or has ever used. He has used the public appeal method and has been humiliated with the

uncertainty of its results and the large per cent. of members not reached by it. He has tried the budget plan with systematic weekly contributions and no public collections and is chagrined to find that it tends to degenerate to a pitiful minimum for the lack of enthusiasm. Thoughtful men are searching for the method by which the business idea of the systematic plan and the enthusiasm of the hilarious public collection may be combined. The modern pastor's preacher grandfather knew nothing of the complex financial problems confronting a twentieth century church. These new conditions in the church make a demand on the preacher for efficiency and patience not dreamed of fifty years ago.

III. *Another demand that the twentieth century is making upon the preacher is the evident necessity for readjustment of our missionary methods.* Besides the necessity of a new financial method implied in the preceding paragraph there has arisen under modern conditions the necessity of changing our plan of securing recruits for our foreign mission fields. The accepted method has been to practically limit foreign mission recruits to those who volunteer for such service. Under former conditions when the dangers and hardships on foreign fields limited applicants for this work to the most heroic and consecrated this plan worked reasonably well. But conditions have changed. Barring complications that have arisen temporarily

on account of the recent world war, the dangers and hardships of the foreign missionary do not surpass and often do not equal those of the frontier missionary and many an obscure pastor at home. The result is that volunteering for a foreign field does not imply necessarily unusual heroism or consecration.

Securing men for our constantly enlarging foreign mission program is an ever present and always pressing question, but coördinate with it, if not superior to it, is the other question of getting the *right sort* of men.

No man surpasses me in affectionate admiration for those groups of young people volunteering every year to become foreign missionaries. Their joyful consecration to the work is beautiful. He would be a cynic indeed who could entertain toward them a critical spirit or speak a word or assume an attitude that would chill their youthful ardour. Because it is so apt to be misunderstood, I hesitate to give utterance to a conviction that has been growing on me for some time. Because of the delicacy of the matter I shall make no dogmatic affirmation but will content myself by asking my brethren to consider with me our methods of gaining recruits for foreign fields, that we may help each other in reaching conclusions as to the soundness of some of them.

Am I wrong in mentioning as a possible objection to our method of recruiting our foreign force

the fact that hitherto our Boards have in the choice of missionaries seemed to regard themselves as being practically shut up to the comparatively small circle of volunteers? If the Boards feel the need of a man to open, for example, a new field in China why should they feel themselves bound to select a volunteer? Why should they not look for a man perhaps better qualified for this particular field than any who have volunteered? Having found him, why should they not take it up with him independently of the volunteer question? That is the way we get our workers on the home field. Whether it is a vacant pastorate, or a vacant secretaryship, or a vacant mission field, we do not *wait* for men to volunteer for it or *urge* men to volunteer for it and then confine ourselves to that list in filling the place. *The approved methods of filling vacancies in undertaking a new work here at home is to prayerfully consider the field and the kind of man it needs and then search the earth for that man. When he is finally located he has perhaps never thought of the place in question, but we lay the burden on him and undertake to convince him that he is the man for the place.*

Am I not right in my feeling that if the Foreign Mission Board will adopt this policy of selecting its recruits it will secure stronger and better men.

Here, as elsewhere, it seems to me fitting that the office should seek the man and not the man the office.

My contention is that we ought to prepare an atmosphere that will make our Boards free to regard any Christian and especially any preacher as a volunteer to the foreign field provided it can be made plain to him that such service on his part is in accordance with the will of God. For a preacher to assume any other attitude would, as I see it, make him a spiritual pervert. This does not mean that the Boards should discount the volunteer in selecting missionaries, but that there should be a greater liberty in choosing outside this noble band when it seems best.

When President Wilson announced his "universal service and selective draft" theory of recruiting our army for the world war, it was met with a widespread, almost universal protest throughout the country. Our people had been accustomed to the volunteer method of securing soldiers. Mr. Wilson's plan was denounced as a "conscript" method. The distinguished speaker of the house left the chair to deliver his soul against it in a perfervid speech. Congress and the country at large were evidently overwhelmingly against Mr. Wilson's idea. But when the people had time for serious discussion and mature reflection they came to see almost unanimously that "universal service" is the only patriotic conception of citizenship and a "selective draft" the only sensible method of recruiting an effective and victorious army.

If it is right to abandon the antiquated volunteer method of recruiting our army why not abandon it as a method of recruiting our missionary forces? The logic of salvation requires that every saved man shall hold himself ready to do anything or go anywhere in obedience to the will of God. If after prayerful deliberation a group of godly men select one of their number as one specially qualified to do a specific work they will have no power to make him undertake it. And if he is the right sort of man he will not undertake it without a personal conviction that it is the will of God, but the very fact of their turning to him will constrain, almost compel him. *"Vox Populi; Vox Dei"* is a proverb more striking than true, but it is true that the voice of the people often makes audible the voice of God and interprets His will. Besides if it is objected that Mission Boards have no authority to require men to go as missionaries the answer is, neither have churches the authority to require men to become their pastors, but pastorates are recruited by the selective and not the volunteer method.

It was a favourite saying with Dr. Carroll that the preacher should have both a perpendicular and a horizontal call, meaning by that that he should both be called of God and called of man. The horizontal call to a specific task to be performed by the preacher has often made plain the hitherto unrecognized perpendicular call. In many cases a

strong, well-qualified man, who feels a delicacy in applying for an appointment as a foreign missionary would recognize the duty of going if a specific field were open to him and he urged to go in and occupy it.

Recently a brilliant theological professor said if he could call back twenty years he would be teaching theology in China instead of America. His unusual gifts as a teacher were recognized by a Seminary in this country about ten years ago. He was offered a position in that school and accepted it. If the Foreign Mission Board unhampered by the volunteer list had selected its men as a Seminary Board did, because of recognized gifts, and had said to him: "We want you to teach in a Seminary in China," he would doubtless be in China now instead of America.

I recently heard the secretary of one of our Foreign Boards tell the appalling story of the large number of men and women who have been brought home from foreign fields temporarily or permanently because they were physically unable to cope with their tasks. Much of this is doubtless due, as the beloved secretary intimated, to the fact that many of our missionaries are overtasked and therefore overtaxed. But I am wondering if much of this overtasking and consequent overtaxing is not due to the fact that on account of our being limited to a small coterie of noble volunteers as a basis of selection we have not always been able to find men

and women with the necessary physical and mental qualifications for this work.

But it is objected that after a man has demonstrated special gifts at home it would be unfair to ask him to give up the salary he could command here at home for the salary he would receive as a foreign missionary. My answer is twofold: (1) If the day has come in any of our work when missionaries are moved to go or stay by the salary test, we had better reform conditions or go out of business altogether. (2) If for any reason a given man ought to have a larger salary than some other man—then give it to him. I see no reason for a dead level in the salary question on the foreign field that would not require, with equal imperiousness, a dead level of salaries on the home field.

IV. But the twentieth century has raised still another problem that challenges the wisdom and grace of the modern preacher. *I refer to the problem of delivering Christendom from the multiplicity of religious denominations.*

Within the past few years there has developed both at home and on foreign fields marked dissatisfaction with these divisions and a growing demand for their removal. Our foreign missionaries tell us that it is impossible to explain to the heathen why there should be several brands of Christianity in the same community. The situation at home is, if possible, more embarrassing.

Travel where you will, in practically every little town you pass you will see from two to half a dozen church steeples, grim evidence of as many religious denominations, each occupying a semi-belligerent attitude to all the others. Often these little organizations are hotbeds of envy, prejudice and strife. Usually they do not help each other but positively hinder each other—often unintentionally, but many times deliberately and designedly. On this matter of the shameful and inexcusable multiplicity of denominations let me show you a few samples.

Example 1. Take a certain train out of Dallas, Texas, and in less than an hour you will come to a little town of 800 inhabitants in which there are, or were at last report, twelve church organizations. It is mortifying that I am forced to confess that half of these are Baptist churches—three for white people and three for negroes. I think there is a good reason why there should be a separate church for coloured people, but no man will ever be able to give a satisfactory reason why there should be three Baptist churches for white people and three for negroes in that village. Nor do I believe that any man will ever give a reason satisfactory to God for the existence of six other white denominations in that town.

Example 2. Take a certain train out of Fort Worth, Texas, and in about half an hour you will come to a little village of 700 people. In this

village, where there is room enough for one church, or two at the most, there are seven church organizations—six of them having their own houses of worship. In this village the Presbyterians have two, the Methodists one, the Disciples two, the Catholics one and the Baptists one. Within five miles of this village there are four other little Baptist churches barely able to "keep house." Will any honest wise man claim that such a confusion of tongues can be pleasing to Him who prayed that His people might be one?

Example 3. In Central Texas there is a small city of some 10,000 people. In a certain section of that little city there are within a radius of two blocks twelve church organizations, a Jewish synagogue and a $75,000.00 Y. M. C. A. building. Each church has its property costing from $12,000.00 to $50,000.00. Of these denominations four are Presbyterian, two Methodist, two Disciple, one Catholic, one Episcopalian and one Baptist, and one Church of Christ Science.

Now these are not exaggerated nor extreme cases. They are fair average samples of the waste of religious forces by which we are causing Israel to sin. In many communities little organizations called churches by courtesy are so thick that they are in each other's way, treading on each other's toes, often spitting and quarrelling and clawing at each other like cats in a basket. The man who can look this thing squarely in the face and not

grow sick at heart is either a fatalist in his philosophy or a pachyderm in his sensibilities.

There is just one reason why we are not going to evangelize the world in this generation and that is that we are confused and perplexed and bewildered and dehearted by our petty divisions at home. If the money and energy and thought and vital force worse than wasted in maintaining unnecessary and hindering denominational organizations at home could be expended on the foreign fields it would constitute a force far larger than all the present foreign mission work of Christendom combined.

The distinct sphere in which this state of affairs affects the preacher in his work is in its limitation of his influence. If he has the shepherd heart he longs to help everybody. But because of little sectarian prejudices he is practically cut off from a large majority of the people in his parish. Even in communities where he is the only preacher people of other denominations will not yield to him their kindly teachable spirit. Thoughtful men of all faiths are coming to see quite clearly the folly of this waste of energy and resources. Many solutions have been proposed—amalgamation, federation, coördination, the so-called community church, etc., as a substitute for a genuine New Testament church. But each has its fundamental weakness causing more evil than it cures and the more thoughtful have felt that one must look still

further for our remedy. The people are looking to their preachers to find this remedy. The true preacher, feeling that he has a message from God to the people will not, because he dare not, mutilate nor materially modify that message as an oblation on the altar of denominational union however devoutly he may wish for its consummation. On the other hand, every sensitive preacher suffers unutterable agony because of the divided front with which Christendom faces its task of world conquest. Personally, I see no available solution for it. The more I study the question, the more I feel like a little child lost in a wilderness. There are three things of which I am absolutely sure. The first is that these petty denominational tribes exist in violation of the spirit and will of our Saviour; the second is that they shamefully hinder the progress of the kingdom; and the third is that the remedies so far proposed are superficial and therefore inadequate. My daily prayer is that God will raise up a modern Moses who shall lead his people out of their bondage to out-worn traditions from which these divisions spring and turn their hearts to the authority of the Holy Scriptures and the absolute lordship of Christ as the one hope of curing these man-made divisions.

V. *But there is yet another new demand that modern life is making on the preacher. I refer to the demand that he should have a part in directing the new rural social mind.* The renaissance of

rural life interests is the most notable sociological phenomenon thus far witnessed by the twentieth century. Since the church has been the chief social institution in rural life it follows that the preacher is the logical man to lead in this new line of thinking. Unless the preacher does take a worthy part in this new rural movement the spiritual power of our country churches will be sacrificed upon the altar of economic efficiency and utilitarianism. The tragic feature of it is that so many people, including many country preachers themselves, do not know that anything unusual is happening around them. They are in the midst of an economic revolution and have not the eyes to see it.

A successful business man, who left the country neighbourhood thirty years ago and made a fortune in the city, seeing the title of Dr. Bickler's book, "Solving the Country Church Problem," said: "There are no country church problems, all the problems are in the town churches." He is a type of many long-range observers and superficial thinkers on this subject. Sentimentalists have idealized "The Little Brown Church in the Wildwood" till many have supposed it to be an elysian field of peace, piety and spiritual power. Many who are writing on country church problems are discussing an idealized memory and not a stubborn fact. They are talking about the country church as they now think it appeared to a boy

thirty or forty years ago. They know little, either from experience or first hand observation, about the complex and perplexing problems of new twentieth century social, educational and economical conditions with which all our country churches are wrestling and by which many of them are being put out of commission. Still thinking of it in the simplicity of its pioneer life they cannot realize the utter unpreparedness of the average country church to cope with its new problems. They know only in a vague general way, if they know at all, that the twentieth century has brought to the country church a new Sunday-school problem, a new meeting-house problem, a new transportation problem, a new social life problem, a new coördination and centralization problem, a new financial problem, a new Sabbath observance problem, a new public school problem, a new agricultural problem, and so on down the line. Because blindness in part hath happened to them they think that all the country preacher needs to do is to preach the Gospel ("gawspell," some of them call it), make himself agreeable to the people and pass all these problems up to Cæsar for settlement. If the country church does not concern itself with these questions so vital to country life, it will soon find that country life does not concern itself with the church. Good leadership is the one essential human element in the solution of these problems. But leadership is itself the gravest problem confronting the coun-

try church. Leadership cannot solve other problems so long as it itself is a problem.

Let us notice some of the elements of weakness in rural pastoral leadership. (1) Preoccupation; usually the country preacher is something besides pastor of this particular church. Either he is preaching to other churches, which fact serves to divide his time and thought and heart, or he is preoccupied with some secular or semi-secular vocation which he is pursuing to make money, or perhaps to make a living, which the church has failed to provide. Wherever the fault may lie, the fact remains that the average country pastor is so beset with other matters that he cannot obey the Scripture injunction to give himself wholly to the ministry of the Word and prayer. (2) Failure to recognize the value, the importance, the dignity of a country pastorate. The average country pastor is a man of genuine piety, sincere purpose, unquestioned doctrinal orthodoxy and notably sacrificial life. The trouble with many, if not most of them, is that they are restless and dissatisfied because they have not eyes to see the thrilling possibilities of a country pastorate. The average country preacher sees in his pastorate a group of commonplace farmers and their more commonplace children, not realizing that out of these apparently commonplace groups are to come ninety per cent. of the men and women who are to be the leaders in shaping the world's thinking and activity. Nor

does he see that more than any man in the world the country pastor has a chance to mould the lives of the young people coming under his influence. Because of its intensiveness the influence of a country preacher with one hundred in his church is greater in the matter of character building than that of the town preacher with a thousand. The country preacher may take the clay in his hands and shape it while the city preacher only touches it here and there with his finger. (3) Lack of training. Pastoral leadership in the country church is often sadly handicapped because the preacher is so poorly educated. An intelligent layman in a strong country church said to me recently: "I do not know what our church is going to do for a pastor. It is true we have about twenty preachers in this county who would be glad to get this church, but we have a nine-months' ten-grade public school where most of our children graduate and many of them are sent off to college. Now, our trouble is that our young people are better educated than any of these preachers. They are all good men, not a stain on one of them, but whether it ought to be so or not it yet remains true that the preacher cannot do much in leading our young people while they regard him as an inferior to themselves in the matter of education." This is not the theorizing of a theological professor, but the result of the pragmatic test made by a country layman. The preacher must be educated if he is to be the capable

leader of a free and intelligent people. Every schoolhouse adds one more argument for the necessity of an educated ministry. Every patriotic man rejoices in the efforts the States of the South are making in educational matters. By generous appropriations from State treasuries "the little red schoolhouse" is springing up everywhere and State Universities for broad culture, and State Colleges for specific professional training are in easy reach of the masses. Add to this the many private schools and the multitude of denominational schools of all grades and it is easy to see how the general average of intelligence is far higher than it was fifty years ago. The thoughtful man must at once conclude that if the preacher is to fulfill his God-appointed mission to this better educated people he must himself be better educated. Dr. Boyce was right when he contended fifty years ago for a better educated ministry, but if there was one reason for it fifty years ago, there are ten reasons now. But there is another reason for training among country preachers. I refer to the change in the character of our population, and especially our country population. Fifty years ago the population of the South was homogeneous. Our people had in a large degree the same traditions, the same early training, the same ambitions, the same language, the same ideals socially, politically and religiously. But to-day, particularly in the Southwest, our population is made up of people with

traditions, ambitions, languages and ideals imported from every quarter of the globe—as widely divergent in intellectual, political and moral thinking as in geographical origin. Fifty years ago it required the minimum of skill on the part of the preacher to be a leader of the homogeneous rural population of the South. To-day the preacher who is to fill the God-appointed sphere of spiritual leader must be equipped with the best possible training to meet and overcome the multitude of divergent, crude and heretical notions that have been imported from everywhere. (4) A further handicap to efficient rural pastoral leadership is a false attitude to the work. If the country preacher's heart is not loyal to rural interests he cannot succeed though he have the tongue of men and of angels. If he does not love country people and cannot fall easily and joyfully into their domestic and social customs he cannot lead them. If cows and pigs and birds and bees and fresh plowed land and growing crops and deep woods and running streams and the rattle of the farm wagon on the rocky road and the meadow's fragrant breath do not fascinate him he ought to move back to town. He can never lead a rural minded people. And he is constitutionally unfitted for rural leadership if he is unwilling to live in the country where his work is. He may get along fairly well against the handicap of living in town if the conditions make it necessary. But the rural pastor

who lives in town because he does not like to live in the country is a failure by inherent maladjustment. (5) Another hindrance to rural pastoral leadership is the pastor's limited time on the field. The " fourth-time " church makes efficient pastoral leadership impossible. There never was a " fourth-time " pastorate. There are many fourth-time preaching stations, but even an angel of light could not be pastor of a church and spend only two days out of each month on the field. Consecutive, constructive pastoral leadership is impossible under such a travesty on the pastoral relation. The preacher may be a devoted man and will do some good, but as an effective leader in the community he is a mere figurehead. Twenty-eight days out of the month his body is elsewhere and his mind is on something else. How can he lead the sheep if he only sees them on the " fourth Sunday in each month and Saturday before "? (6) Another hindrance is frequent change of field. Time was when a country pastorate of thirty to fifty years duration was not an uncommon thing. Now the pastoral tether, particularly with country and village churches, is from one to two years. More often one than two. Real leadership requires time for perfecting plans and establishing confidence. A brief pastorate may admit of fervour and enthusiasm and a superficial success, but it makes impossible constructive, permanent, far-reaching leadership. I am not seeking to place the blame,

whether on the church or on the pastor, but I suspect that if all the facts were in, honours or dishonours would be found about equally divided. The chief cause of these frequent and disastrous changes are (*a*) the failure of the country church to provide a decent support for the preacher; (*b*) the ultra-conservatism of country people making them unwilling to follow the leadership of a wide-awake aggressive pastor; (*c*) the preacher's ambition to be considered prominent; and (*d*) the preacher's unwillingness to get down to the drudgery of the pastorate after the newness has worn off.

But some one says, if pastoral leadership fails, why not turn to lay leadership? The trouble is it, too, has its inherent, almost prohibitive, weaknesses. To begin with, the farmer's ultra conservatism makes him a poor leader. Water cannot rise above its level. Again, highly developed individualism among rural populations makes leadership a difficult task. It leads the masses to resent one of their own number trying to lead them, and it causes the proposed leader to resist the idea that he should have any altruistic interest in or personal responsibility for the public welfare. For another thing, neighbourhood jealousies make local lay leadership practically impossible. If a layman develops and begins to exercise some functions of leadership, the people at once begin to suspect him and call him a boss—a dictator. Soon he retires from his advanced position, made sore by the criti-

cism and opposition which jealousy inspires, and the church drops back into its former dying rate of spineless conservatism. Petty neighbourhood feuds also hinder lay leadership. If this man takes any prominent part in the work that one will not work at all because forsooth their fathers quarrelled over a division-fence twenty years ago.

Now, a word of practical suggestion looking to a solution of this leadership problem. Concerning the preacher I would suggest three things: (1) Insist upon his availing himself of his many opportunities for education and equipment; (2) deliver him from the handicap of preoccupation by paying him a living wage; (3) insist upon his making his home among the people to whom he ministers. This would of course imply that each church shall have its own pastor—the whole and not the half or the fourth of a preacher. Most of the half-time and many of the fourth-time churches could do this if the church would adopt even approximately the scriptural ideal of giving and if the preacher would be willing to live among and as his people. Concerning the layman and leadership, I would suggest three things: (1) Cultivate an atmosphere of vision—of high spiritual ideals. Nothing will contribute more to the quality of leadership than a quickened spiritual nature, an opening of the eyes to see the otherwise invisible hosts on the mountain side. (2) Suggest to individuals spheres where leadership may be exercised, not only in the

church but in general community interests, and see that the responsibility of such leadership is laid upon them. Let your man get the taste of leadership in some altruistic community movement, even though it is outside the church, and he will be thereby encouraged and qualified for leadership in the church. (3) When a man has been set to lead in any phase of church life, urge all the people to encourage him and coöperate with him in it, thus discouraging petty jealousies and neighbourhood feuds.

A lack of efficient leadership explains all the other weaknesses of the church. Put your finger where you will indicating the weak spot in your church and it can be easily shown that this weakness could be remedied by capable leadership in so far as human skill can remedy it. The problem of our churches is the problem of leadership. We are guilty of criminal negligence if we do not more intelligently discover, develop and utilize the latent leadership lying in waste places all about us.

VI. *But still another task that the twentieth century life has brought to the preacher is that of stopping the leak by which the churches are losing annually twenty-five per cent. of their increase.* In former days of slow and difficult travel and limited knowledge of the outside world there was a minimum of moving from place to place. It was thus easy for a church to keep in touch with its membership. But now since the world has grown so

small and the means of getting over it so easy, rapid and cheap, people are constantly "on the move." It is easy to see how this fact presents a problem to our churches. The condition in multitudes of our communities justifies the remark of the minister who said he preached to a procession and not a congregation. Under such conditions, how easy it is for a church to lose a large per cent. of the results of its evangelistic efforts.

When water is scarce and hard to get a wise man looks for and tries to stop all the leaks in his vessels. A little investigation will convince any thoughtful man that the matter now being discussed furnishes a grave problem for modern Christianity. Let us illustrate:

By the courtesy of Dr. E. E. King, the author has been permitted to examine his file of the minutes of Collin County (Texas) Baptist Association for the past twenty years. This is numerically the largest and in every respect one of the best associations in Texas. During the twenty years from 1897 to 1916 the association showed the following statistics:

INCREASE IN MEMBERSHIP

By baptisms	10,758
By letter	8,682
By restoration	513
By statement	327
Total increase	20,280

For the same twenty years they had the following:

DECREASE IN MEMBERSHIP

By letter	8,203
By exclusion	1,333
By death	872
Dropped	907
Total decrease	11,315

Subtracting total decrease from total increase leaves a net increase of 8,960. In 1897 they had a total membership of 4,991. Add to this the sum of 8,960, their net increase for twenty years, and it gives 13,951, which should be their total present membership. But as a matter of fact their present membership is only 8,270. *This shows that 5,681 out of the 20,280 additions have slipped through their fingers.* According to the records they have not died nor have they been dismissed by letter nor excluded, nor even "dropped." They have just played out—evaporated. To return to our figure, we fill the bucket every day and it leaks out one-fourth of its contents every night. What has become of these 5,681 whilom Baptists? They say there are only three ways to get out of a Baptist church—by letter, by expulsion, by death. These 5,681 did not go out through any of these gates, and yet they are out.

When the western stockmen ask Pastor R. F. Jenkins what business he is in, he has a way of saying, "I am in the sheep business." If he should

tell the stockman that in addition to those that he sells or kills or those that die of disease he loses every year one-fourth of his sheep and is not able to tell what became of them, I suspect the westerner would set him down as a poor sheepman and advise him to go into some other business.

Collin County is not peculiar in this matter. This one is cited because I happened to have the data convenient. Nor is this leakage a Baptist peculiarity; any other denomination would probably make as bad a showing—some of them perhaps worse.

But for a further illustration of this leak, let us take a glance at the statistics of the Southern Baptist Convention. In this same twenty years, from 1896 to 1916, they have baptized 2,330,000. During that period they show an actual net increase of 1,106,000. Thus their increase is less than half the number they have baptized. In other words, they have lost half the people they have baptized. Based on these figures, the report of a church to an association would read like this:

Baptized	100	
Died	15	
Excluded	3	
Dropped (formally)	3	
Still members or dismissed by letter	47	
Evaporated	32	
	100	100

In short of every 100 members received in the Southern Baptist Convention in the last twenty years, thirty-two have leaked out and no one knows where nor how.

May I suggest four things that in my judgment are largely responsible for the leak: (1) Carelessness in receiving members. In the first place we do not give due diligence to ascertain if applicants have been really converted. A magnetic evangelist gets the crowd going his way and numbers are taken into the church night after night practically without examination, investigation or instruction. Many of these being without genuine faith drop out and ought to drop out. One of our most successful evangelists, whom I greatly honour, has not liked me for twenty-five years because at the beginning of a meeting he held with me I publicly requested that all who desired to join the church during the meeting should confer with the pastor before making application for membership. We did not have as many joiners as we would if the pastor had taken the bridle off, but we probably had better stickers. (2) Slipshod methods in receiving those who join. Most of the people who join the church under my observation get in with almost nothing being said about the sacredness of the obligation implied in church membership. For the first four years of its history nobody ever joined Seventh and James Street Church, Waco, without hearing the Church Covenant read and

solemnly promising to live up to the ideals set forth therein. I have no doubt that the glorious achievements of that noble church are largely due to this habit in its foundation days. One of the things they thus promised was, "When we remove from this place we will, as soon as possible, unite with some other church." Emphasizing this duty would prevent much of our leakage in membership. (3) A lack of diligent pastoral oversight. The New Testament ideal of pastoral oversight would imply that if a member left the community the pastor would know when he left and where he went, and try to put the church in the new community in touch with him. The so-called pastor, who for any reason dissuades one of his members from moving his membership when he removes to another community, is too silly to preach even to a flock of geese and too selfish to minister to a pack of wolves. But God forbid that I should put all the blame for this lack of pastoral oversight on the preacher. How can a quarter-time preacher or an absentee preacher or a preacher semi-secularized to keep his family from want, exercise diligent pastoral oversight? If we wish to stop this decimating of our flocks we must put up the money to support some shepherds while they care for the sheep. (4) A failure to utilize lay-helpers in looking after the membership. In Kentucky a country church had as its pastor a theological professor who was therefore necessarily an absentee pastor

except for his twice-a-month visits. Realizing that under this handicap he could not personally look after his flock he divided the membership into eight or ten groups, committed each group to a carefully selected member of the church—and made it his duty to exercise oversight of those on his list. Such a method carefully planned and diligently worked would certainly prevent much of the waste growing out of members falling by the way and being ultimately lost to the work of the church.

As a matter of self-preservation we must check this leak. To gain nothing is bad, but to recklessly waste what we gain is worse. A good many years ago Mr. Roosevelt began emphasizing the shameful waste of our material resources—our forests, our waterways, our mineral wealth. While the evil is by no means entirely overcome we have made notable progress, as the result of influences he inaugurated, in the conservation of these sources of temporal prosperity. In the church our chief human resources are men and women. With amazing extravagance and appalling indifference, we are wasting these resources. Let us pray that God will raise up some mighty man who will show us how to conserve, husband, utilize these our marvellous elements of strength.

X

THE NON-OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS OF THE OFFICE

"I am ready to preach the Gospel to you also that are in Rome."—ROMANS 1: 14.

BEYOND question the pastor's primary, essential, paramount duty is to his own parish. Above everything else he must be a shepherd to the particular flock of which the Holy Spirit has made him overseer. This truth cannot be stated with too much emphasis nor held with too much tenacity. But this fact does not preclude the proposition that the office of pastor not only permits but implies duties beyond the local pastorate. Let this chapter be given to the consideration of some of these outside duties.

1. *His duty to the general activities of his own denomination.* He is a sorry preacher who takes no part and feels no pride in the educational, beneficent, and missionary activities of his people. He will rejoice in all altruistic enterprises by whomsoever fostered, but if he is the right sort of man he will take special interest and experience peculiar pride in the general activities of his own people. In certain sentimental and superficial at-

mospheres the word "denominationalism" has come to have a bad odour. There seems to be a distinct if not organized propaganda intended to discount as narrow and bigoted the man who shows a romantic devotion to the doctrines, practices and activities of his own denomination. Is a man narrow because he takes pride in the history and achievement of his own family? Is a citizen of this country a pent-up provincialist discounting the courage of English, French and Italian soldiers because of the peculiar glow that came over his soul when he read of the noble part the American soldier played in the recent world war? Are patriotism and provincialism identical? Are loyalty and bigotry synonymous? Dr. J. B. Gambrell quaintly said: "I would not have a dog that would as soon trot under another man's wagon as under my own." I am sure my distinguished friend would heartily accept the converse of his proposition stated somewhat like this: "I would not have a dog that felt called upon to raise a row with every dog trotting under any other man's wagon." One of these statements looks toward denominational loyalty; the other toward Christian courtesy and fellowship. They are by no means incompatible. The man who cannot with all the unflinching chivalry of a knight errant stand for the doctrines, traditions, past achievements, present plans and future prospects of his own people and at the same time recognize, rejoice in, and thank God for the

good to be found in others, is too small to be an exponent of the democracy of Jesus. If a bellicose ministry was a menace in a past generation, a jellyfish ministry is doubly a menace in this.

Now having said this much by way of emphasizing the general proposition of denominational loyalty, let us consider some of the specific duties that the preacher owes to his denomination.

(1) He should be familiar with and help to circulate the literature that deals with the propaganda of his people,—whether in its doctrines or its practical activities. Each of the great religious denominations has its weekly paper devoted to the general interest of its work and its missionary literature devoted to world evangelization. Denominational esprit de corps, to say nothing of the highest degree of usefulness, demands that the preacher shall be a diligent student of this literature. It is good for the preacher to have a wide range of reading. It is good for him to be familiar with the teachings of the fathers. It is good if he has wide knowledge of current theological literature and knows the trend of every school of religious thought. But it is little short of a tragedy if he shall become so obsessed with the past or so enamoured of the broad currents of the present that he has no time and no heart for the present-day practical achievements of his own people. Without discounting the value of anything else in which he may be legitimately interested, it is unquestion-

ably true that for all practical purposes in world evangelization he is the most useful preacher who knows and takes pride in the literature and achievement of his own people.

But the right sort of preacher will not stop with a personal knowledge of the activities of his own people nor will he be satisfied with personal loyalty to them. He will seek every means of giving this information to his people and arousing their loyalty to all the practical altruistic enterprises of their own denomination. When a pastor becomes so spirituelle that he cannot get down to such practical things as, for example, the circulation of his own denominational paper, he has about become so good that he is good for nothing.

(2) Again the right-minded preacher will seek to objectify denominational intelligence and denominational loyalty into contributions of cash to maintain denominational enterprises. Happy the preacher who has right conceptions of the doctrine of stewardship in the matter of money and who is willing to teach it faithfully and who has the gift of causing this teaching to bear its fruit in sacrificial giving. Some have right views on the subject but fail to teach them. Others teach them faithfully enough but seem unable to practically apply their teaching in such a way that it will produce practical results. Others not only hold and teach right views of stewardship but are able to cause this teaching to materialize. They know how

when they have preached on financial stewardship to get their people to "perform the doing of it." It is a fine art and every preacher owes it to himself, to his people and to his God to become an adept in it. I have intimated elsewhere in these lectures that money raising is not the highest function of the preacher. But there is no inconsistency between that statement and the proposition that a true pastor will see to it that his people give of their means to maintain all the altruistic enterprises of his denomination. It is not only his duty to see that they give this money to these activities but he must create for them such an atmosphere in his congregation that giving will be done not niggardly but liberally; not grudgingly but hilariously; not superficially but sacrificially.

(3) But the pastor owes still another duty to his denomination at large. He should be an active and intelligent participant in formulating the policies and plans by which his denomination is to function in its benevolent, educational and missionary program. This does not imply that he is to be overweeningly ambitious for leadership. It simply means that he will hold himself ready for any service to the cause at large for which he may be qualified and to which his brethren may call him. It does not imply that he shall become a religious gadabout but it does mean that he will when at all practicable be a regular, an interested and an intelligent attendant upon the district, state and na-

tional meetings of his denomination, diligently performing in these connections such duties as may be assigned to him.

2. *We shall now consider briefly the pastor in the social circle.* He is a member of society as well as a member of the church. He has his obligations to one as truly as to the other. In a very peculiar way he is, more than other men, a servant of the church but like other men he is also a servant of society. In finding his true course here he must often, like the mythological ancients, sail between Scylla and Charybdis. Dr. Hoppin says: "There may be two opposite errors in ministerial conduct in regard to society: a minister may have so strong a desire to separate himself from worldly things and worldly men as entirely to lose the social spirit; or, on the other hand, he may have so intense a desire to smooth the way for good influence among all men, and to come down to the level and sympathy of all, that he may not only thereby lose his dignity, but may compromise his principles; and he may unconsciously adopt the principles of the world and of the evil there is in society. He may go so far as to come upon the ground of doing evil that good may come. The Saviour said of His disciples, 'They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world'; yet He prayed that His disciples should not be taken out of the world, but kept from its evil. The middle course is thus the true one. While in the world,

he should not be of the world; but he should show that religion is a principle strong enough to live in the world. If the minister surrenders too much, and suffers himself to be governed by the same principles that govern the world, so that he may have social intercourse with it, he gives no clear testimony to the divine spirit of his Master, neither will he be able by this means to raise society but will himself be dragged down by it."

It is a humiliating fact that even some of the best of ministers in the matter of urbanity, courtesy and refined manners often suffer in comparison with men of the world. They seem not quite so scrupulous in the amenities of social intercourse and the ordinary requirements of the well-bred gentleman. Because a minister removed his hat while talking to a lady in a hotel lobby, a brother minister standing near said contemptuously, "Look at that fop." The preacher is not to affect the tricks of a dancing master but he is to be a man of sterling refinement. I am for the man with his hat off and his coat on in the presence of a lady. Unless he would mar his usefulness he must both know and practice the courtesies common among cultured people. In his addresses before Felix, Festus, Agrippa, and on Mars Hill, Paul manifested the highest type of both physical and moral courage. But who ever read these courageous addresses without seeing in them the evidences that, with all courage, Paul combined the elements of

courtesy and refinement. He was as brave as Julius Cæsar and as courteous as Chesterfield. Dr. Barron is about right in saying that the characteristics of a gentleman consist chiefly of two qualities—courage and courtesy. Let us pray that in every preacher these two qualities may be so mixed that the whole world may point to him as the ideal man. Substitute the word "Preacher" for the word "Christian" in the following utterance from President Woolsey of Yale and you have well expressed the truth I am seeking to emphasize: "It is a lamentable fact that some men, who have had no pretensions to a religious character and neglect their duty toward God, are gentler, more forbearing, polite, and courteous in social life, than some men of undoubted piety. Why is this? It may be for the same reason that a clergyman who dabbles in commercial matters will do things at which honest merchants would hesitate. They are in the habit of examining questions belonging to mercantile honesty, and he is not. And so a man who has learned that the gentlemanly character involves gentleness and forbearance, being desirous of the character or the reputation of it, will put a force upon himself, and become habituated to those qualities, or at least to the show of them, without having yet attained to true fundamental virtue. Thus we see that by familiarity with the duties to society involved in the term gentleman, one man of no very exalted virtue will have a great ad-

vantage over another of the best disposition who has overlooked them. It seems to us, when the amount of influence and happiness lost by this neglect is considered, that it is wholly inexcusable. Indeed, we know not what can excuse a Christian, the servant of the gentlest, kindest, justest Master, from being a gentleman, unless a natural want of delicacy of feeling, which it is beyond his power to alter. With no such defect he ought to be the more successful in rearing the flowers of gentlemanly intercourse, for they have with him a better root. And he cannot fail of being more successful, if he will form a clear notion of this term in its highest import, and feel that it may help him in practice to have such a standard before his eyes. There is every need that a Christian should be a gentleman, a man of gentle soul and manners, of the nicest justice, of simplicity in character and taste, of a collected spirit; there is ordinarily no reason why he should not be one." Thackeray gives a good definition of the word gentleman when he says: "It is to be honest, to be gentle, to be generous, to be brave, to be wise, and, possessing all these qualities, to exercise them in the most graceful outward manner." Bishop Hare put it well when he said: "The real gentleman should be gentle in everything, at least in everything that depends on himself,—in carriage, temper, constructions, aims, desires. He ought therefore to be mild, calm, quiet, even, temperate, not hasty in

judgment, not exorbitant in ambition, not overbearing, not proud, not rapacious, not oppressive; for these things are contrary to gentleness."

May a word be spoken here touching the test of a preacher as a gentleman in his attitude to women? Paul states the broad principle when he exhorts Timothy to treat "the elder women as mothers; the younger as sisters with all purity." In the South, and particularly in the old South, the formal deference paid to womankind has been almost a replica of the old days of chivalry and knight errantry. Women in competition with men in commercial life and at the ballot box will doubtless tend to modify this attitude at least in external formalities. There are, however, some of us who hope that the time will never come when it will cease to be true that one of the distinguishing marks of a gentleman is the deference and courtesy he accords to women. In my training, for example, I was diligently taught that no gentleman would remain seated while a lady stood whether in a parlour or a public hall or a railway train or a street car. From this tradition of our fathers I pray that neither I nor my sons, nor my sons' sons shall ever depart. Every time I see a young ruffian violate that rule I feel like taking him by the collar. "Ladies first" was the chivalrous slogan when passengers were being rescued from the sinking *Titanic*. I trust that no young preacher who fails to live up to that rule will ever dishonour

me by referring to me as his teacher. Concerning that typical gentleman Robert E. Lee, Dr. Bond tells the following story: "General Lee was in the cars going to Richmond, and had a seat at the extreme end. The other seats were filled with officers and soldiers. An old woman, of humble appearance, entered at one of the stations, and finding no seat, and none having been offered her, approached the general. He immediately arose, and gave her his seat. Immediately there was a general rising, and proffering of seats to 'Marse Robert,' but he calmly said, 'No, gentlemen: if there was no seat for the infirm old woman, there can be none for me.' The effect was remarkable. One after another got out of the car, as if the seats were too hot to sit on; and the general and the old lady soon had the car before them where to choose." If a preacher has not in him instinctively this element of chivalry let him cultivate it. If there is in him no embryonic rudimentary germ from which he can develop the real sentiment, then, as a matter of common decency, let him assume it that the ministry as a calling be not blamed. The preacher should be God Almighty's gentleman.

"The next best thing to being a Christian," wrote William Carey to his son, "is to be a gentleman." A cultured woman was rejoicing in my hearing recently over the fact that her pastor was a man of refinement. She said, "Our former minister meant well but he was so lacking in refine-

ment that he rarely went in company without perpetrating some egregious social error. But I would risk our present pastor in any company with the guarantee that he would meet every social demand however new and unexpected, with the unerring instinct of a gentleman." Such a state of affairs must be comforting indeed to a sensitive woman. But while it is important that the preacher should be a gentleman both by instinct and training and should be able to conduct himself with propriety in any social circle a word of warning needs to be spoken.—A preacher with social instincts and qualified to move easily in social circles is in constant danger of yielding too much time to the social demands of the community. One of the most popular and accomplished ministers in the South lamented in my presence recently, as if it were a tragedy, the fact that the demands the people in his congregation and out of it made upon his time for purely social functions had well-nigh dehearted him of spiritual power. The gospel preacher is not to be a recluse, a hermit, an anchorite, but neither is he to forget Paul's "this one thing I do." I seriously doubt the preacher having a right to any social function that cannot be made to pay tribute in some way to the furtherance of the Gospel through his ministry. It is glorious if he can make social functions contribute to the spiritual success of his ministry but it is nothing short of tragic if he makes his ministry subservient to so-

cial functions. To be a "good mixer" is a much desired and a very desirable quality in the ministry, but what is his advantage if in mixing freely and easily with the people he does not turn them to the Saviour and the higher and holier living? If the preacher justifies giving a large part of his time to social functions on the ground that he may thereby refine and elevate society, there are two questions to be asked: (1) What will society do to him while he is trying to elevate it? (2) Is the preacher's mission merely that of exercising a refining and elevating influence? When Paul wrote to a young preacher: "These things speak and exhort and rebuke with all authority," he must have had in mind something more than a nice polished gentleman exercising a wholesome influence in the social circles in which he moved. The ideal preacher will never forget that he is a gentleman, neither will he ever forget that in addition to being a gentleman he is a prophet of God—a man sent from God whose task is too lofty and whose time is too precious for much of the so-called social functions of our modern life. Every man is bound to make the most of himself. This the preacher cannot do if he allows himself to be made a social lion. "In it but not of it" is the preacher's safest attitude toward most of the society functions of our day. John Ruskin's saying, "An artist ought to be fit for society and keep out of it," applies with equal force to the preacher.

This is a good place to say a much-needed word about the minister's care for his personal appearance. The first word shall be about his apparel. Shakespeare has Polonius saying to Laertes: "Costly thine apparel as thy purse can buy; but not expressed in fancy: rich, not gaudy; for the apparel oft proclaims the man." The preacher should not become a walking clothes-horse for a tailor-shop but he should consider Shakespeare's words on this point as diligently as if they were Scripture. A shoddy, ill-fitting suit of clothes, baggy at the knees and ornamented here and there with grease spots is about as poor a recommendation as a preacher can carry about with him. It not only makes him unsightly in appearance, but it makes him uncomfortable in feeling and awkward in bearing. A well-dressed man not only commands increased respect from other people, but he has a heightened respect for himself. His collar and cuffs and shirt front should be as immaculate as his reputation. Normally he should shave every morning as scrupulously as he washes his face. *May I give a prescription for the preacher's first hour after arising? Here it is: A bath, a shave, a tooth-brush vigorously applied, a finger-nail file skillfully used, a brush and box of shinola in appropriate contact with his shoes, a few minutes of "setting up" exercise in some approved form of physical culture, a dip into God's word and a season of prayer.* This will be rather bitter medicine

for some men known to me, but I risk nothing in guaranteeing that if a man will take it he will face the day's task not "like the quarry slave at night scourged to his dungeon" but with a buoyant, triumphant, conquering spirit—that will make work a joy and crown the day with success.

In this connection a word ought to be said touching the minister as a guest in the homes of the people. More than men of any other calling he will be a recipient of gracious hospitality. The minister should always bear in mind that this courtesy is as a rule not for his own sake, but for the sake of the Master whom he is supposed to represent. With this thought ever before him, he should accept hospitality in such a spirit as to bring no reproach upon Him whom he represents in the home. He should also constantly remember that another reason why he is a guest in this home is because his hosts believe that in some way he will bring a moral and spiritual benediction to the home. What a shame if his conduct is such as to disappoint this reasonable expectation. Too many ministers take these courtesies as a mere matter of course and show little or no appreciation of them. A loyal friend and frequent host of preachers was saying the other day that very few ministers who had been entertained in his home showed by word or deed the slightest appreciation of hospitality extended them. A good woman talking to a min-

ister recently said, "I want to thank you for the nice letter you wrote us after you had been a guest in our home. For twenty-five years our house has been the preacher's home. Scores of them have been our guests all the way from one day to two weeks, but you are the only one who has ever written us a line after he reached home, expressing appreciation of our hospitality."—I almost apologize for making public the fact that a minister of the Gospel supposed to be a man of refined and knightly character could so far forget or neglect the common instincts of a gentleman. The fact is mentioned here only to give an occasion for expressing the hope that every preacher who hears or reads these words will make it a part of life's program to write a letter of thankful appreciation, immediately on reaching home, for the hospitality of a brother's house.

While on this subject let us think for a moment of the fine art of letter writing in general. It affords the preacher at once a fine method of making friends and an open door for usefulness. Has a friend far away lost a loved one? Write him a letter of condolence and comfort. Is he struggling under peculiar burdens? Write him a letter of sympathy and encouragement. Has he gone over the top with some noble achievement? Write him a letter of congratulation. Has he written a helpful book or a good article for paper or magazine? Write him a letter of appreciation. Is he

a plodder, pegging away at the commonplace humdrum duties of an obscure and non-spectacular life? Write him a letter of inspiration. What a matchless opportunity letter writing affords us of fulfilling the law of Christ by bearing one another's burdens. These delicate gentle courtesies, small as they may appear, are, after all, the things that give to life its zest, its sweetness, its aroma. A gentleman, to say nothing of a Christian, should "brighten the corner" for his friends. In the nature of the case his contact along this line will be largely with people of his own religious faith, but it should not be confined to them alone. He is a member of the church, but he is also a citizen of the world. His sympathies and helpful ministrations and delicate attentions should reach out even to those we call men of the world. He may thereby win them. But even if he does not win them religiously, he will have fulfilled the injunction to do good unto all men.

3. *A third sphere in which the pastor will function beyond his pastorate is in the realm of civic reforms.* Here extremes are easy and must be avoided. At one extreme is the preacher who because of a perverted notion of the sacredness of his office refuses to take any part in a general citizens' movement for the reform of moral or social conditions. At the other extreme is the man who seems to regard himself a kind of self-appointed detective to discover, expose and reform

whatever delinquents may be lurking in the community. The former forfeits the respect of many of the best of his fellow-citizens because they believe him to be a coward. The latter crying "wolf! wolf!" so often forfeits the confidence of thoughtful men on the ground that he is fanatic. Fortunately the preacher is not under the necessity of making a choice between these two extreme positions. The safe and proper place for him is between them. He may and should give steady and effective aid to every moral movement and to every step toward social betterment. While it is usually neither best nor desirable there may arise conditions under which he should become the leader in such movement. Certainly his attitude toward all such questions should be such as to leave no doubt about his views and such, if he is not to lead in the movement, that those who do lead will not hesitate to call on him for service. His concern for the well-being of the community at large should be so vital that he would never fail to render such service if within the bounds of reason. When he does go in it ought to be without embarrassment and certainly without apology. It will probably not get him anywhere to be constantly explaining that he is in as a citizen and not as a preacher. When he is in, he is in and the people will not make any fine distinctions between the man and the office. The truth is the call to preach is commonly regarded by the people as so vital and

fundamental and permanent that when they think of a preacher they are unable to dissociate the man from the office. Since this is true the preacher is under special bonds to so conduct himself, in these semi-secular campaigns, that neither the minister as a man nor the ministry as a calling shall be discounted in the thinking of the people.

4. *A fourth sphere in which the preacher should function outside of his church is in the field of evangelism.* A church should be dissatisfied with its pastor if he has not sufficient evangelistic gift and soul-winning passion to make him willing to spend at least one-sixth of his time in revival meetings beyond the limits of his own pastorate. And the pastor ought to be dissatisfied with his church if it is not willing for him to carry out such a program. A somewhat wide field of observation covering a period of more than forty years has convinced me that the happiest, most harmonious, most prosperous and most orthodox pastorates have been those out from which the pastor, with the loving consent and coöperation of his church, did a large amount of evangelistic work in the regions beyond.

Such a program so far from hurting the church will greatly help it. It will demonstrate Christ's great doctrine of gain by loss. May I mention seven ways in which this end will be accomplished? (1) It will give the church wider vision. When the pastor goes far hence to preach to some desti-

tute field, the heart of the church goes with him, and the people are led to realize by actual practice that the field is the world. (2) It will quicken the spirit of intercession. I never feel so irresistibly moved to pray for my pastor and for lost men outside my own small circle as when he is in a soul-winning campaign in some distant community. (3) It will cultivate the Christly spirit of unselfishness. Whatever may be the superficial appearance to the contrary, the church that seeks to get and keep for itself is dying at the heart. Only the church that throws itself with artless abandon into the task of world conquest is really prosperous. Nothing will do more to cultivate this spirit of unselfish service than for the church to send its own pastor at its own charges to minister in destitute places. (4) It will deepen in the church the passion for soul-winning at home. It often happens, and it is psychologically to be expected that it should happen, that when the pastor returns from a distant revival meeting he finds the home church aglow with evangelistic fire and insisting upon a campaign for souls. (5) It will produce harmony. Next to a revival in its own midst consciousness of a personal share in a revival elsewhere will make an atmosphere where bickering and strife are not only not indigenous but where they cannot live. (7) It will promote orthodoxy. Have you ever seen a soul-winning church go wrong in fundamental doctrines? A decline in the

evangelistic passion always precedes a departure from the evangelical faith. Evangelism at home and abroad is almost an infallible guarantee against heterodoxy.

But there are also seven ways in which this outside evangelism will help the preacher. (1) It will afford him a change from the ceaseless grind of his own pastorate. It is the ideal way for the pastor to take a vacation. God forbid that I should seek to qualify as the self-appointed critic of my brethren, but I have never understood the psychological process by which a preacher, normally strong physically, could justify taking a month or more of his time each year to lie around and vegetate in some sequestered spot.—Doubtless conditions may arise once or twice in a lifetime when the normal preacher will really need that sort of thing. But the preacher would in most cases spend a vacation more profitably, both for himself and for the cause, if he gave it to two or three revival meetings in really destitute fields. Usually the best and most needed rest is found not in the cessation but in the change of activity. Deacon H. Z. Duke used to tell of a remote rural community which had no religious meetings on Sunday. He said to a man, "What do you people do on Sunday?" The laconic reply was, "We jess set and think." "But," said the deacon, "when you get tired thinking what do you do?" "Then we jess set," was the self-satisfied reply. "Jess setting" is

the poorest possible way for the normal preacher to rest. (2) It will give him a deeper appreciation of his people at home. The fact that his people are willing to sacrifice somewhat their own interests that they may gratify his evangelistic passion will stir in a chivalrous preacher's heart a sense of abiding affectionate appreciation and gratitude. (3) It will make him better satisfied with his own field. Intimate touch with the problems of other fields will lead him to see that his own difficulties are not unique and perhaps are not as bad as they seem. (4) It will broaden his sympathies and widen his sphere of influence. Every revival meeting held puts him in the closest spiritual touch with a new group of people and there will be those in each such community whom he will be able to guide and influence as long as they live. (5) It will materially add to his stock of sermon material. Many of the best illustrations the preacher has grow out of observations and experiences during revival meetings. (6) It will deepen his own spirituality and stimulate his insight into the spiritual meaning of God's word. This grows largely out of the fact that in a revival meeting more than at any other time the preacher, feeling his own helplessness, is driven to rely in a special way upon the presence and power of the Holy Spirit. (7) It will stir in him anew the passion for the lost. Saving the lost is the preacher's preëminent business. Whatever stimulates him at this point is a blessing indeed.

XI

SOME LOWERING SHADOWS OF THE OFFICE

"In weariness and painfulness."
—2 CORINTHIANS 11: 27.

PERHAPS none of us would agree with Frederick W. Robertson that shadows constitute the predominant element in the minister's life. Yet every thoughtful person realizes that the preacher is beset with difficulties, perplexities, sorrows and shadows peculiar to his office. Let us take a brief glance at some of these shadows.

1. *The meagre, uncertain, semi-mendicant character of his support.* It is meagre. Leave out fifty cities and the average salary of the preachers in the United States is less than six hundred dollars per year. His pay is not far below the rest of the wage-earning world, but when the preacher compares his income with that of professional men, it seems very small indeed. For a concrete case here are two brothers. One a preacher; the other a lawyer twenty years his junior. The preacher is confessedly the lawyer's equal in native ability and has had better literary and professional training. The lawyer gets a retainer fee of six thousand dol-

lars a year from one firm whether he has a case in court or not. The preacher at the lawyer's age was receiving the munificent sum of seven hundred and twenty dollars a year.

This is not meant to encourage the too frequent whine which the preacher makes about the inadequacy of his pay. The truth is that the capable, trained, consecrated preacher will receive sufficient compensation to keep him and his family in reasonable comfort. Having this, why should he not be therewith content? The real hardship here discussed is not that the right sort of preacher does not get a reasonably comfortable living, but that there is no justice in the disparity of his compensation and that of his brother lawyer, doctor, etc. Every right-minded preacher knows that in this and many other things he must forego his inherent right for expediency's sake. Let the preacher decide for himself if there is truth in this paradox: Often the preacher has no right to do what he has a right to do.

Furthermore, the average preacher's pay is not only meagre but it is uncertain. Other salaried men receive their pay at a specified time. In the majority of the pastorates the preacher never knows just when he will receive his. In fact there are many pastorates in which about the only thing a preacher can be certain of is that he will never receive all that is promised him. He makes his monthly bills with little hope that he shall be able

to meet them promptly when they are due because it is reasonably certain that the church will not be prompt in paying him.

But the worst feature about the preacher's support is that he is often regarded by those who provide it as a sort of semi-mendicant. It is hard to persuade some virile men that a preacher is not an object of charity. There is, for example, a merchant who runs on his books what he calls a charity account. Under this account he credits himself with his monthly payments on his pastor's salary. This item appears on his books with the amounts he contributed to the widow and the orphan, and the blind Italian with his monkey. If that by no means unusual attitude to the preacher does not cause his face to mantle he has soapsuds in his veins and not blood. Every chivalrous, high-minded preacher chafes, not so much because of the meagreness and uncertainty of his salary, but because in receiving it he is supposed by many to assume about the attitude of a mendicant friar. An infidel lawyer once referred to me as "the man who makes his living by passing the hat." It makes my blood boil and to this day I almost want to fight him every time I see him. The only consolation I find in it is that his statement had not an atom of truth in it. I have done a good deal of hat passing in my life, but it has always been for somebody else and never for myself. The pound party, the Christmas donations, the ten per cent.

discount on dry-goods, the half fare on railroads, all have their origin in the idea that the preacher is about half man and half beggar. All kinds of euphemistic explanations can be made of these "courtesies" to the preacher, but in the last analysis they spring from the yet widespread notion that the preacher is a kind of modified pauper who must be at least partially maintained by donations from the tender-hearted.

2. Another shadow in the pastor's life is found in an *embarrassing separateness.* People will not accord the preacher the same treatment they give other men. In trying to give the preacher a little better treatment than they give to each other they arouse in him a sickening sense of isolation and aloofness. The manly preacher does not want to be coddled; he does not want to be put on a pedestal; he wants to take his place in the trenches with the rank and file; he has no use for the Pharisee's prayer, "I thank thee that I am not as other men." The genuine preacher knows and wants others to know that he has no sacerdotal accessories that entitle him to respect apart from the respect due to any man of worthy character. Worldly men sometimes refer somewhat obsequiously to their "respect for the cloth." The preacher's "cloth" is no more entitled to respect than that of the ditch digger. In both cases it is what is inside the cloth that entitles the man to respect.

I suppose that nobody ever really said that there were four genders—masculine, feminine, neuter, and ministerial. If one might judge, however, by the patronizing air some people assume to the preacher and alas, alas, by the effeminate bearing of some preachers themselves, such a grammatical distinction could be successfully justified. If there is anything in the whole realm of the genus homo that fills a genuine soul with a disgust and contempt beyond words it is the ministerial mollycoddle who admits for a moment that there are virile qualities and manly functions that other adult males may properly have and exercise but which are foreign to him.

Phillips Brooks strikes a responsive chord in every right-thinking preacher's heart when he says: "I wish that it were possible for one to speak to the laity of our churches frankly and freely about their treatment of the clergy. The clergy are largely what the laity make them. And though one may look wholly without regret upon the departure of that reverence which seems to have clothed the preachers' office in our fathers' days, I think he must have many misgivings about the weaker substitute for it, which in many instances has taken its place. It was not good that the minister should be worshipped and made an oracle. It is still worse that he should be flattered and made a pet."

3. The preacher finds a further shadow in

frequent *misinterpretation and misrepresentation.* More than the man of any other calling the preacher is before the public. His actions and his utterances are scrutinized more closely, judged more rigorously and aired more relentlessly than those of any other man. The ignorant, the narrow, the visionless and the bigoted do not understand him because they are not capable of seeing things from his viewpoint and they therefore innocently misinterpret him greatly to his loss and sorrow. The vicious, the self-seeking and the spiteful do not want him to be understood and therefore they maliciously misrepresent him. When you consider the mistakes that he does make and add to them the multitude attributed to him that he does not make, it is really a wonder that a preacher ever gets out of any community with a decent reputation. But the masses are reasonably sane and intuitively know how to make allowance for ignorant misinterpretation on the one hand and malicious misrepresentation on the other.

In my younger days I drove an ox team. The team was slow and my dog, which always followed me, would relieve the monotony by frequent excursions into the woods after rabbit or squirrel or deer. Often he would protract his quest for hours and sometimes after stopping my team to make a bootless search for him, I would conclude that I had lost my dog, but after so long a time he would dash up with smiling face and wagging tail just as

if nothing had happened. After a few such experiences I learned that if I would keep my team moving in the middle of the road the dog would take care of himself. This parable teaches that if a preacher will do right he need not worry about his reputation nor stop his legitimate work to chase it and protect it. Given noble character and correct conduct reputation will take care of itself. My hearer concedes the soundness of this position, but next time he is misinterpreted or misrepresented he will wince and flinch and chafe, and perhaps leave his task unfinished and chase off after his reputation to see that no harm comes to it. Philosophize about it as we may, it must be admitted that to be put in a false light before a community hurts—unless indeed one is a veritable pachyderm as to sensibilities. But the preacher should not nurse these wounds nor seek to punish those who inflict them. Hoppin, with his habitual poise, says: "A minister should cultivate a large-hearted and loving patience, which is like a sea into which all the misapprehensions and even enmities of men shall immediately sink and be forever forgotten." Punishing his enemies, real or imaginary, is the poorest business that ever engaged a preacher's time and talent.

4. *Another pastoral shadow is the frequent unexpected waywardness and worldliness of trusted members of his church.* Every good man in the community is grieved by such a tragedy, but the

pastor most of all. In the first place, he realizes more than any one else the harm that will come to the cause of Christ. And again, apart from the offender's immediate family, the pastor has a deeper interest in him and a keener affection for him than anybody else. Besides, if he is a true shepherd the pastor has a sense of personal responsibility for the offender's conduct. Whatever may be the opinion of others in the matter of responsibility the conscientious pastor often chides himself for the waywardness of a member, saying, "If I had been a little more faithful perhaps this could not have happened." In the old geographies was always seen a picture of Atlas bearing the world on his shoulders. In a very real sense the true pastor feels himself to bear some such relation to his church. As there was weeping in every Egyptian home for the unexpected death of the first-born, so there is a tear in every genuine pastor's heart for the worldly and wayward in his church.

5. *A fifth shadow attending this office is the responsibility and difficulty of leadership.* The pastor is not to lord it over God's heritage; he is not to be a dictator, however benevolent; he is not to be a boss like a foreman over a bunch of railroad section hands; but as we have already seen, the nature and titles of his office imply the duty and responsibility of leading his people. To be a leader without being a boss presents one of the most delicate problems in the pas-

tor's experience. Here he is confronted with the problem of exercising God-given pastoral authority without becoming offensively dictatorial. The pastor knows that his office implies a certain degree of authority in the church and yet he knows that he cannot appeal to that authority to enforce coöperation in any plan he may have for the church. Conscious of his authority he is also conscious that his only way to exercise it is in the sweet reasonableness of moral suasion. Every advance movement the aggressive pastor undertakes will be met with indifference, with criticism, with opposition. How to go forward against this tide and carry the indifferent, the critic, the opposer with him is the preacher's preeminent problem of leadership. He will need suppleness, dexterity, agility, firmness, candour, courage, tenderness, severity, perseverance and any other virtue that a beneficent Providence may graciously bestow on him. To successfully lead a church with five hundred members in aggressive spiritual activities implies a versatility of talent unsurpassed by any of the captains of industry or finance or militarism. The man who doubts that such a task is heavy with trials has not tried it.

6. There are many other shadows haunting the pastor's life, such as a consciousness of personal imperfections, stubborn alienation of the people from the pastor and from one another, death in his congregation, especially of the wicked and unpre-

pared, financial reverses, domestic scandals or other crushing shadows in the homes of his people.

But passing these without comment let us consider finally his heartrending and often inexplicable periods of *ministerial barrenness.* For the first year of his pastorate new people and new conditions and new problems give piquancy and enthusiasm to his ministry but during the second year the new wears off. He and his congregation are no longer new to each other and while familiarity has not perhaps bred contempt, it has dulled the edge of former zeal. It is proverbial among observant ministers that the second year is usually the most trying period of a pastorate. The philosophy of it is in the fact that the relation has subsisted long enough for the superficial novelty to wear off and not long enough to develop vital spiritual affinities. This explains psychologically why the majority of pastorates terminate about the end of the second year. But whether at this crucial time or at some other period in his pastorate the gloom of fruitless activity will settle like a London fog about the preacher's bewildered soul and the nightmare of a barren ministry will hold him suffering but helpless in its grip. Alas, for that day! For then, if man ever suffered, the true pastor suffers. Self-condemned for indifference and indolence he prods himself into former activity, but it brings not the old-time joy to his own heart nor finds the old-time response in the hearts of others. The house is on

fire and he is constantly running to and from the well but he finds no pleasure in it because he knows he is running with an empty bucket. The battle is on; he puts gun to shoulder and fires with the old-time regularity of movement and precision of aim but no enemy bites the dust as of yore; the cartridge is blank. It is harvest time; with fan in hand he throws the straw and winnows nothing but chaff. It is the time of ripe fruit; he opens his basket in the market-place—nothing but leaves. A tempestuous sea overwhelms him. The rocks of eternal promise upon which his feet were wont to rest flee and crumble. He is wandering in a desert and the heavens are swept clean of his North Star, his Ursa Major and every familiar constellation. Thus brooding on his barrenness he is soon obsessed with an abnormal mental depression. If he looks on a doughnut he sees nothing but the hole. If he reads the One Hundred and Sixteenth Psalm he sees the third and eleventh verses and misses the rest.

Let this chapter close with an incident from the experience of a Texas preacher in one of his earlier pastorates. It was about the close of the second year and the preacher was suffering horrible depression on account of what he conceived to be a barren ministry. On Sunday morning he preached a doleful sermon and at its conclusion spoke about as follows:

"Brethren, I think I ought to resign my pasto-

rate. I am doing no good. I remind myself of the man in the Old Testament whose axe fell off the handle into the creek. My work here is about as profitable as his would have been if he had gone about the forest beating on the trees with his axe-handle. I think I ought to quit and go somewhere else."

When the congregation had been dismissed a brilliant and pious but somewhat eccentric old bachelor approached the young Jeremiah and said: "Pastor, did you say the young man lost his axe?"

"Yes," answered the pastor mournfully.

"Well, what did he do when he lost his axe? Did he leave the forest and go off to another unsuspecting grove of trees and begin beating on them with his axe-handle?"

"No," said the preacher.

"Well, what did he do?" pressed the benevolent inquisitor.

The preacher, with a tear and a flash of hope starting simultaneously in his eye, answered, "He went back where he lost it and got it."

"I think," said the kindly critic, "that my pastor better go back to the spot where he lost his axe and get it."

Full many a preacher has lost his power who could easily regain it, if he would go back to the time and the place where he lost it and rectify the wrong that caused him to lose it.

May the surrendered heart and the spirit's

anointing cause the lost axe to swim for every discouraged preacher. May the Lord give us power.

The best remedy for this shadow of conscious imperfection is that one shall be the right sort of preacher. If a man will be a true shepherd the shadows will come, but they will not discourage. If ministerial shadows are to be illuminated, the preacher must furnish a forward-looking, an upward-looking and an outward-looking ministry.

The pathetic call of our churches is for shepherds;—shepherds, not brilliant spellbinding pulpiteers; shepherds, not skillful diplomatic ecclesiastical engineers; shepherds, not adept and tactful church financiers; shepherds, not partisan proselyting buccaneers; shepherds, not egotistic, self-seeking privateers; shepherds, not cold-blooded logical doctrinaires.

Our Preëminent Need is

An unselfish, sacrificial spirit-filled ministry; not a self-seeking, ease-loving, worldly-minded ministry; a pure, holy, spiritual ministry; not a gross carnal sensual ministry; a liberal, broad, bountiful ministry; not a niggardly parsimonious sordid ministry; a vigorous, forceful, efficient ministry; not a flabby, feeble, flat-minded ministry; a strong, valiant, sturdy ministry; not a weak, flaccid, limp ministry; a firm, dignified, stalwart ministry; not a stale, languid, insipid ministry; a fertile, fruitful, prolific ministry; not a lean, barren, sterile minis-

try; a keen, effective, diversified ministry; not a spiritless, pointless, monotonous ministry; a resilient, buoyant, fervent ministry; not a heavy, prosy, frigid ministry; a piquant, seasoned, animated ministry; not a tasteless, vapid, lifeless ministry; a virile, masterful, compelling ministry; not a vacant, void, vacuous ministry; a hardy, bold, daring ministry; not a hothouse, trembling, cringing ministry; a gentle, meek, tender ministry; not a vitriolic, vituperative, vindictive ministry; a sane, steady, genuine ministry; not a sensational, spectacular, meteoric ministry; a modest, unassuming, humble ministry; not a pretentious, pompous, ostentatious ministry; an alert, wide-awake, animated ministry; not a lethargic, comatose, moribund ministry.

XII

SOME INSIDIOUS SNARES OF THE OFFICE

"Flee also youthful lusts."—2 Timothy 2: 22.

THE layman, thinking superficially, believes that the preacher is practically free from temptation. It must be admitted that there are forms of temptation that beset other men from which the preacher is at least partially exempt. But it is also true that the very nature of the preacher's office implies certain snares of whose seductive allurements the average layman knows little. In this lecture we will discuss some of these ministerial snares.

1. The first is the snare of *Indolence.* In most occupations the employer can tabulate a man's work and tell how much he has done each day and make a fairly accurate estimate of how much time he has put in on his job. Not so with the preacher. His congregation cannot tell, neither can he with any degree of accuracy, how much time he used in the preparation of a given sermon. He can tell how much time he took for the physical act of writing the sermon, but he cannot tell how much time in reading, meditation and prayer it took to

grow it. The fact that his employers cannot tell how much time he works sets a snare for his human frailty tempting him not to work. He can tell, and perhaps some of his employers can tell, how many hours daily he spends in his study, but neither he nor they can tell whether those hours have been fully employed with things pertinent to his task. In those hours in his study he reads many books, has many dreams and sees many visions, but have all those books and dreams and visions been of a type calculated to forward his work? Perhaps more than any other employed man the preacher has an opportunity to waste time unrebuked. With many the opportunity is shamefully utilized. The average preacher wastes more time than he works at his job. I speak both from experience and observation. I do not mean that he is idle more time than he is occupied, though there is some room for talk at that point. What I do mean is that he allows himself to be drawn into a lot of petty, Lilliputian performances that are of no value. If the twentieth century preacher will turn aside from trivialities and inconsequentialities and adopt Paul's motto, "This one thing I do," and if he will whip himself out of his ease-loving indolence, joining with Paul in "labouring night and day," he will always be in demand and his activities will be surprisingly fruitful.

2. *Jealousy.* It is a humiliating confession but observation forces me to the conclusion that except

physicians, preachers are more given to jealousy than men of any other calling. Christ's forerunner seems free from it, for we learn of his rejoicing because of his own decrease and another's increase, but His apostles seem to have had their share of it, since we have instances of their unblushing competition for chief seats and the privilege of being called the greatest even on the most sacred occasions. That good men could be subject to such a foible cannot be easily explained. I have never heard a preacher admit that there was even a semblance of it in his breast, but often those who most stoutly disclaim it give evidence of its present existence. Nothing is more insidious than ministerial jealousy and no refined frailty more despicable and none more fatal ultimately to both happiness and usefulness. Cain, Joseph's brethren, Saul and Haman are outstanding illustrations of the direful results of jealousy cherished in the heart. Its ruinous effect may not be in every case so spectacular as in the cases cited but it will be none the less certain.

3. *Autocracy.* Peter exhorts the elders, "Tend the flock of God which is among you, exercising the oversight not of constraint but willingly, according to the will of God; nor yet for filthy lucre but of a ready mind neither as lording it over the charge allotted to you, but making yourselves ensamples of the flock." Clerical refusal to heed the injunction not to tyrannize over the church has

wrought great havoc in the world. The insidious, inch-by-inch progress of this tendency toward clerical tyranny culminated in the papal hierarchy and all its blight and tragedy. Dr. Jefferson brings a strong but deserved indictment against it when he says: "What is the story of a thousand years of church history but the tragic narrative of how the ministers of Christ little by little compacted themselves into a hierarchy which became at last the most blighting and intolerable despotism that the world has ever known? The tyranny of the mediæval church was the tyranny of clergymen. Laymen were crowded out of the place appointed them by the church's founder. Reduced to mere spectators they had no voice whatever in the government of the church, all authority being gathered up into the hands of ecclesiastics, who, rising rank above rank, formed a compact organization culminating in one supreme head who claimed authority transcending that of the mightiest of the Cæsars, and whose agents, distributed throughout the world, lorded it over the consciences of men, gathering into their clutches all the kingdoms of life. It is the supreme tragedy of Christian history that this ecclesiastical passion for power in the mediæval church brought a disgrace upon Christianity from which it will not recover for another thousand years. The whole world suffers to-day because of what mediæval clergymen did. The cause of Christ is hampered because of the preju-

dice planted in the human heart by the imperious and high-handed policy of the ambitious leaders of the Church of Rome."

But while this tendency to ministerial autocracy has had its most obnoxious efflorescence in the Church of Rome, the preacher of every denomination, even the most democratic in government, has his ever-present temptation to the unwarranted assumption of power. It may help us to reënforce ourselves against this trend if we analyze the situation and point out some things in the pastoral office that have a tendency to make the preacher autocratic, domineering and overbearing.

(1) The very nature of his office. He holds the highest office. He is constantly reminded of this fact, especially by the laymen. It is easy for him to conclude that one holding such an exalted office should be granted extraordinary authority. Since he is a shepherd and the members of his congregation are only sheep, it is right that he should do their thinking—should manipulate and control them. Thus he abuses the beautiful shepherd metaphor to exalt himself and to assume prerogatives expressly forbidden in the word of God.

(2) The nature of the work. In no other calling is a man quite so independent of human authority. In the matters of ordering his time and choosing his tasks he is more than any other man "monarch of all he surveys." He may write or read or visit, or he may do all these or neither just

as he likes, and there is no one to say him nay. If he desires to miss a preaching appointment now and then or omit any other pastoral duty he does so without so much as saying "by your leave" to anybody. Compared to other callings, what a large liberty is accorded the preacher in the matter of how and when he shall do his work. This comparative immunity from human surveillance has its inevitable tendency to develop the lordly spirit. Happy the man who can and will use this liberty without abusing it.

(3) His social prestige. In whatever social functions the minister may figure there is a homage paid him not accorded to other men. His official position gives him a social prestige which is often far in excess of what his natural qualifications would justify. There is a constant danger that this "burning of incense" before the minister shall develop in him an unwarranted sense of superiority and lead him to expect and ultimately demand tribute which he has no right to levy.

(4) His free hand in eliciting, combining and directing the activities of the church. The right-thinking minister covets the coöperation of his people in mapping out and executing the program of the church but too often they are busy about other things and gladly give the pastor *carte blanche* here. Too many take the view of the deacon who when called on by the pastor to lead in prayer, said: "Pray yourself; we pay you for it."

This habit of turning everything over to the preacher—the product of indolence or indifference or worldliness—cultivates in the preacher the unhappy notion that the church is his personal property. The New Testament indeed makes him a leader and an overseer, but the church's unscriptural habit of leaving everything in his hands too often makes him a dictator and a boss. The result is that he too easily comes to regard his personal interest and the interest of the church as one and the same—when they are perhaps very different. Very often the preacher accuses members of his congregation of opposing the church when they are only protesting against some vagary of his.

4. *A mild form of hypocrisy.* Before elaborating this point let me say with emphasis that in my judgment the preacher is the most transparently frank, sincere, ingenuous of all professional men. But he is all of that in spite of many temptations to be otherwise.

The first cause of an undertow in this direction is that the people have a tendency to apotheosize him,—to put him on a pedestal above his fellowmen. Since the people seem determined to posit him in this sphere of mental or moral or official superiority he is constantly beset with the temptation to play the part. Critical analysis of his inner life reveals to him the fact that he is a man like other men, subject to like passions with them. But the people insist on believing that because he is a

preacher he is essentially a man of loftier character, deeper consecration, more sacrificial spirit than other men, and he is tempted to humour their too high estimate of the difference between himself and others. When Paul and Barnabas preached in Lystra the people called Paul Jupiter and Barnabas Mercury and the priest of Jupiter would have sacrificed oxen and garlands to them as to gods, but the manly preachers vehemently forbade it. Would that every preacher had sense and grace to meet every such sycophantic tendency with equally candid protest. It will pay the preacher to tear from his brow all the garlands that he knows he does not deserve to wear, it matters not how sincerely they may have been placed there. What he would lose in servile flattery and popular adulation he would gain in rugged self-respect.

The second tendency to a mild form of hypocrisy grows out of the preacher's desire to secure and maintain the good-will of his people. This may and usually does spring from both a selfish and an altruistic motive. If he does not maintain the good-will of his people he cannot retain his position. It is equally true that if he does not command the good-will of his people he cannot do them any good. So on both the bad and the good side of his nature he is tempted to play a little politics, to deal out some complimentary platitudes beyond justifying facts—to profess an affection, a confidence, an appreciation not quite real. Let us

not forget, however, that being a gentleman and being a hypocrite are not quite synonymous. Preferring to say pleasant things does not imply hypocrisy any more than choosing to say disagreeable things implies sincerity. Every man, and especially every preacher, is bound to dispense all the pleasure he can consistent with truth and duty.

5. *An excessive sentimentalism.* Every worthy character is seasoned with a good measure of sentimentalism, but in a sturdy, stalwart man it is never predominant and should never be prominent. The very nature of his task dealing largely with the will and the emotions tempts the preacher to abnormal sentimentality. The ardent exclamations, the perfervid interjections, the tear-watered expostulations, the "sniffing little anecdote of doubtful authenticity," and other humid literary exhalations by which the preacher seeks to work up the feelings of his audience often fill the workaday man out in the crowd with secret disgust. An Episcopal layman, editor of the *Bellman* (Minneapolis), making no secret of his nausea, inquires, "Where do ministers get all these incidents of sanctimonious drooling? Is this sort of thing a part of the curriculum in theological seminaries, or does there exist a Bureau for the Dissemination of Personal Religious Anecdotes such as there is for supplying funny stories for after-dinner speakers? The touching story of the 'great merchant' who condescends to talk religion to one of his

humblest clerks or that of the prominent lawyer who in the midst of his plea turns aside with patronizing ostentation to acknowledge his belief in the Deity, or that 'illustrious statesman' who is never too busy to wrestle in prayer so that any one who is passing can make a note of it. These and hundreds more of like tenor serve to elucidate the discourse of a certain type of clergymen. If he could by any sort of possibility know how these examples of business piety which he considers so laudable affect the layman, or knowing it could possibly understand how these things cause real men to fidget and squirm and swear inwardly he might learn to reserve these nauseating anecdotes for exclusive use among those less sophisticated in the ways of the world." Even though a little censorious is he not doing the preacher a good turn in calling his attention to a very prevalent fault? Pathetic anecdotes, emotional illustrations, and pious ejaculations repel rather than attract the twentieth century layman. He both needs and wants some solid food. This does not mean that even the big layman does not need to have his feelings stirred. It does mean, however, that the gushy, frothy, effusive, historical (?) incident by which the preacher often seeks to accomplish this end is capable of arousing no higher emotion than that of disgust.

6. *Despondency.* When the modern preacher considers Elijah and Jonah he counts himself in

direct line of prophetic if not apostolic succession. The gourd vine and the juniper tree have loomed large in the experience of the average preacher. This evil spirit seems native to every land and for it there is a name in every language. How universal and yet how foolish and even sinful is despondency. When these fits are on him the preacher is oversensitive and feels himself slighted and neglected. He is sure that his talents are underestimated and his achievements not appreciated. He is halting between resigning his pastorate and committing suicide. What is the cause of this strange undertow? Sometimes it is indigestion or other physical disorder, sometimes it is an overstrained nervous system; sometimes it is a selfish overestimate of his own merit; sometimes it is spiritual backsliding. Whatever the cause its fears and misgivings are usually imaginary and steal away as silently and unexpectedly as they came, leaving no scars.

Hoping that it may hearten some despondent preacher let me quote a few words from Marcus Dods in his diary for March 8, 1860. He says: "No day passes without strong temptation to give up the work—the temptation appeals to me on the ground that I am not fitted for pastoral work; writing sermons is often the hardest labour for me, visiting is terrible. I often stand before a door unable to ring or knock—sometimes I have gone away without entering. A lowness of spirit that

costs me a great deal to throw off is the consequence of this, and a real doubt whether it would not be better for myself and all whom it may concern that I should at once look for some work that I could overtake." If my preacher friend is saying "Marcus Dods is writing my biography" let him console himself with the further reflection that this same despondent Marcus Dods became a great college president and one of the foremost preachers and scholars of the nineteenth century. Brother, if the Lord has put you into this ministry, don't quit. Things will get better further on.

7. *Narrowness.* The man was doubtless slandered of whom it was told that he prayed, "Lord, bless me and my wife, my son John and his wife, us four and no more." But some of us are headed very decidedly in that direction. What greater blight could befall a preacher than that he should be narrow, short-sighed, dim-eyed? How lavish God is when He blesses a man with the seeing eye. They say that a cat can look at a king. They tell the truth but a cat cannot see a king. It may see his crown and his royal robe and his waving sceptre and all the physical appointments of kingship,—but it cannot see the inner qualities of chivalry and patriotism and altruism essential to the making of a king. No man is really qualified to preach whose power to see and apprehend is limited to his physical senses. Elisha's servant was a cringing coward till in answer to the prophet's prayer his

eyes were opened and he saw the hitherto invisible hosts of horses and chariots of fire filling the mountainside.

There are three classes of men: those who see less than they see, those who see just what they see, and those who see more than they see. To which of these three groups do you belong? Your achievements in life will depend largely upon the answer to this question. Three men stood on the northern shore of the Island of Cyprus looking toward the southern shores of Asia Minor. One of them, John Mark, saw only privation, hardship and danger. He saw less than he saw. Sergius Paulus saw a people and country somewhat similar to his own. He saw just what he saw. Paul saw a heathen people converted to Christ with their churches and preachers and glorious kingdom activities. John Mark saw less than he saw and, becoming a reactionary, went back. Sergius Paulus saw just what he saw, and becoming a conservative stayed just where he was. Paul saw more than he saw, and becoming a progressive, hastened into a boat bound for Asia Minor that he might pull down to earth the churches he had seen floating in the air above the cities of Derbe, Lystra and Iconium. Oh, for an Elisha to pray for the opening of every young preacher's eyes that he may have what Paul called "the heavenly vision." A little, narrow, picayunish, pigeon-toed preacher is an ecclesiastical monstrosity. Along with culture

and spirituality and consecration may the Lord give His preachers the seeing eye.

8. *The snare of the "big I."* Humility is a jewel wherever found. It is nowhere more charming than in the life of a minister. In that life its opposite seems most incongruous and unsavoury. And yet the preacher seems to be tempted more than most men to exploit himself. Observation leads me to believe this statement true, whether we consider his private conversations, his public utterances or his printed productions. Many preachers seem to have lost all sense of ordinary propriety and natural delicacy to say nothing of Christian humility when they come to speak and write of their own achievements. If a man has prayed all night or read an unusual number of books, or endangered his health by zealous religious activity, he need not advertise the fact. It will get out on him and when it does it will come out in better odour than if he tell it himself. It is quite possible that he has added an unusual number to the churches, has raised phenomenal sums of money where everybody else had failed, and has solved difficult denominational problems that had baffled our greatest leaders, but the news would sound better if somebody else discovered and announced it. It may be true, but generally is not, that some secular enterprise has offered him several times larger salary if he will give up the ministry and give his great financial genius to pro-

moting a tin whistle factory or a patent dimmer for a Ford car. But if all this happened the report of it will sound better coming from the secular enterprise instead of the preacher. It may be further said that when such an offer is made it is far from complimentary to the preacher. Imagine a business man offering John A. Broadus or Phillips Brooks or B. H. Carroll a job. It may be that the church and the people generally are saying that yours is the most constructive and fruitful pastorate that the church has ever known. That is a very refreshing piece of ecclesiastical history but it does not look good over the pastor's signature. How would this do for an article in next week's denominational paper:

"How I Surpassed All My Predecessors

"Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in unblushing detail how their ministry is resulting in more additions, larger audiences, and greater collections than the commonplace labours of those who preceded them, it seemed good to me also to give an account of how in my various pastorates I surpassed all my predecessors.

"In my first pastorate the audiences quadrupled in three weeks what they had been for six months before my going. In another pastorate the mission collections were twice as large my first year as they had been the year before I went. In another pastorate the church built a splendid house of worship immediately after putting me in the pastoral saddle. So remarkable are my evangelistic gifts that in one of my pastorates more than twenty people

came forward in one of our regular Sunday night services when no meeting was on to ask for baptism. In another pastorate the church had enjoyed a precarious existence for years under the leadership of my predecessors and after years of struggle had only about fifty members when I took charge. I remained there four years and when I left the church had a membership of seven hundred."

Now who will deny that I have had a remarkably brilliant pastoral career if one may judge by these samples? Surely you will remove your sandals and prostrate yourself before me, saying, "Sir, you are a person of preëminent importance."

But sacrificing egotism upon the altar of the truth of history I must confess that while all I have said is true—it is only half the truth. The whole truth will take all the glamour away and leave me a very ordinary individual. The whole truth is that in the first pastorate there had been no pastor for more than a year preceding my brilliant advent. No wonder the congregations grew. In that pastorate where the collections made such an advance the church had before my going been served by a semi-hardshell preacher who never took any collections at all. It is not hard to double nothing.

In that pastorate where the fine house was built the money had all been raised, plans adopted and contract let under the ministry of my predecessor. He did the work and I got the newspaper pyrotechnics.

In that pastorate where the score applied for baptism at a regular Sunday night service I failed to tell that they were all children from a near-by orphans' home, converted in a meeting held in the home by another brother, which meeting I did not even attend. Twenty of the children wanted to be Baptists and ours happened to be the nearest church to them.

In the last spectacular instance where the church grew from sixty to seven hundred, I failed to state that the little church had for years been trying to maintain itself in the remote outskirts of Waco, where there was almost no population, and about the time of my becoming pastor, had moved into town under the shadow of Baylor University in the heart of the thickest Baptist population in the world. The growth was due to change of location and not to brilliant pastoral leadership.

I have said these things for a twofold purpose. In the first place I want to comfort my ordinary compatriots who have wondered why the brethren's pastorates were so brilliant while theirs were so commonplace. In the second place I want to suggest to my brilliant brother that when he has written a report of work, making self-laudatory comparisons of the present with the past, the best disposition of that report is to stick it in the fire.

All such comparisons are usually misleading and always " odorous "—malodorous, and should never be made by a self-respecting preacher.

XIII

SOME GLORIOUS REWARDS OF THE OFFICE

"Henceforth there is laid up for me the crown."
—2 Timothy 4: 8.

IS it good to emphasize the preacher's reward? May we not thus vitiate his work by appealing to unworthy motives? There are those who would have us believe that the preacher ought not to consider his rewards, neither temporal nor spiritual. One school tells us that the preacher must act from a high sense of duty, another that he must be moved by a broad altruism and still another that he must be constrained by the impulse of gratitude and so on through the list. The truth about it is that the preacher is not shut up to one motive or set of motives. He will probably be moved by a composite force including the fear of punishment, the hope of reward, gratitude, altruism, idealism and a cold sense of duty. None of these are bad, but, within proper limits, are altogether good and worthy. There is certainly nothing essentially unworthy in the preacher seeking encouragement from a consideration of the rewards that shall come to him as a result of the

faithful discharge of duty. On this subject Dr. C. E. Jefferson truly says: "In all His paintings Jesus leaves no unfinished pictures. If He paints a sower sowing the seed, He paints also the harvest growing golden in the sun. If He sketches men working in a vineyard, He sketches them at evening time receiving each man his wages." When Peter said: "We have left all and followed thee," Jesus encouraged him by saying: "There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, and the Gospel's but he shall receive a hundredfold now in this time, houses and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecution; and in the world to come, eternal life." Paul in his old age encouraged his own drooping spirit and through the ages helped millions of his fellow Christians by emphasizing the ultimate reward of faithful service when he said: "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." Throughout the Scriptures men are appealed to and urged to action on the basis of the reward the action will bring. So there seems to be no good reason why the preacher may not be

led to think gratefully of the rewards that may come in the course of his life-work. In this chapter let us consider some of these rewards.

1. *His temporal rewards.*

(*a*) *Financial.* As a rule the preacher is not overpaid. In many cases, particularly in country churches, he is underpaid. But the average preacher is not the starveling that the brother long on statistics proves him to be. In the average town a little investigation will show that the preacher's income is about equal to the superintendent of the public schools. He will have a pretty hard time living on his income, but there are doubtless school teachers in his town, and clerks and office men who are paid no better than he. The statistical brother deceives himself about the pay the preachers get by overlooking the fact that probably fifty per cent. of the preachers included in his generalization are either not preaching at all and therefore getting no pay from the churches, or are preaching for one-fourth or one-half time churches, and give from three to five days each week to some secular work. Both these rather large classes receive pay not included in the statistician's estimate of how much pay the preacher gets. Then, too, our statistical brother ought to remember that if it is sometimes poor pay it is also sometimes "poor preach." Personally I rejoice in every step toward increasing the pay of the preacher. If I were writ-

ing on that subject I could give some unanswerable reasons why it should be done. My only purpose here is to show that there is not as much ground for pity toward us preachers as some people would have us believe. As a class we are not very well paid. In most cases we would do better work if we were better paid. But the fact that the people appreciate our ministry enough to feed and clothe us and our families, while we give ourselves to it, is gratifying. That this support is rendered voluntarily, as a rule gladly, and often at a sacrifice is to a thoughtful man a reward for his service. This reward does not lie so much in the money paid as in the sincere appreciation of service that the paying of the money implies. Whatever may be said on the subject, this way or that, it is certainly in order to express the hope that we are, or soon shall be, forever delivered from the whining, dissatisfied, despondent, dependent preacher who is always on the brink of starvation but never quite willing to topple over the precipice. In the same breath, let us venture the wish that we may see no more of that tribe of laymen who pity and patronize the preacher because he is so poor. About the only piety some laymen lay claim to is the fact that they make a show of feeling sorry for the "poor half-starved preacher" and on every possible occasion wail over him because he is so badly treated. Dear brother layman, take notice, from one who knows, that all that sob-stuff about the preacher and his

hungry family is out of date. Your attitude of patronizing pity is as Hamlet said about another anachronism, "a custom more honoured in the breach than in the observance." Pray have done with it. No manly preacher appreciates it. The preacher does not want your pity. He wants you to get in the game with him and join him in a manly effort to advance the ball. A preacher with average ability, average training, average piety and average consecration will get at least an average living out of his ministry.

(*b*) *Intellectual.* The preacher has the advantage over others in that, more than men in any other calling, except perhaps a college professorship, he has the opportunity for intellectual pursuits. There are laymen in every community hungering for knowledge but denied the opportunity of pursuing it because of the time consumed by the petty details of earning a living. Such men would be almost willing to pluck out the right eye for the preacher's opportunity of living in the atmosphere of books. This layman usually, not always, makes more money than the preacher, but the preacher will, or may if he will, make more man. My fear is that few preachers properly appreciate this blessing. Have you ever looked out through your study window to see an ambitious young fellow patiently toiling, digging a ditch with a group of uncongenial companions? What would he give, my brother, for your opportunity of fellowship with

the great men whose books are on your shelves, but he must dig the ditch that wife and babies may be fed. Have you ever humbly thanked God that the work to which He has called you gives you in this respect such a distinct advantage over most of your fellow-men? Do you figure that in as one of your assets when you come to consider the rewards of your office?

(*c*) *Social.* A little while ago a young preacher was a dinner guest in an elegant home along with a group of the leading people of the community. During the social hour, after dinner, he suddenly left the room. His host found him on the back porch weeping. When he could talk he said: "I was comparing my social status before I became a minister with that which is mine to-day, and the facts overwhelmed me. Before I was a minister my social environment was poverty, squalor, ignorance and vice. Since I became a minister the best social life is open to me. The blessing of it melts my heart with gratitude to God." But it is objected that this is an exceptional case—that most preachers moved in first-class social circles before entering the ministry. The facts justify the contention. But this admission does not alter the fact that the ministry affords social opportunities not equalled by any other calling. The truth is, that the preacher's opportunity for congenial social life is so good that it furnishes a constant menace to his ministry—tempting him to employ time in

purely social functions that might be more profitably used elsewhere.

(*d*) *Domestic.* The family circle is a charmed zone. Every normal man who has a well-ordered home life appreciates it and is blessed by it. It is the lament of the average business man that he has so little time with his family. Here as elsewhere the preacher has the advantage. While other men are necessarily away from home all day and often part of the night the preacher may and usually does spend much of the daytime at home, the majority of preachers maintaining the private study in the residence, thus enjoying the home atmosphere and at the same time contributing his part toward making it wholesome.

Another element of the blessing of his home life is that the preacher's wife is usually a woman superior to the average of her neighbours in all the higher home making qualities. If a young preacher does not marry well it is his own fault. As a rule he has the pick of the community in which he lives. Put a young preacher in competition for a young woman's affection with young men of equal ability and attractiveness in other callings, and in three cases out of four the preacher will walk off with the prize. After writing this last sentence I read it to a young lady in my office and asked her if she believed it to be true and if so why it is true. She said she believed it to be true and that the reason for it is that the very nature

of the young preacher's calling implies that his character has been tested and approved. The very fact that he has been ordained a preacher is a pretty safe guarantee that he is a man of good record, stable character and high ideals. Another reason not mentioned by her is that as a rule a young woman is altruistic in her thinking and she feels that to marry a preacher would give her the best opportunity of serving others. Whatever the philosophy of it, the fact remains that as a rule the preacher's home is blessed above others with a woman peculiarly qualified for the high office of wifehood and motherhood and home maker.

A Roman Catholic author says, "Be it ours, therefore, to love the people. Is it not to that end that we have no family ties? Yes, I invoke pity for the people; pity for their sufferings, their miseries, their prejudices, their deplorable subjection to popular opinion, their ignorance, their errors. Let us, at least, try to do them good—to save them. Therein lies our happiness; we shall never have any other. All other sources are closed to us; there is the well-spring of the most delectable joys. Apart from charity, what remains? Vanity, unprofitableness, bitterness, misery, nothingness." Hear his wail "We shall never have any other!"

Commenting on this utterance, Hoppin says: "These words, though evidently the words of a noble man, have a sad tone, as if the 'bitterness and nothingness' had been experienced because the

writer's heart had been closed, by the unscriptural imposition of celibacy, to domestic joys and affections; and the argument itself by no means holds good, that because a man has no wife and children to love, he will more readily love the people, since he has nothing else to love. But he has something else to love; that is, himself, or a phantom of the church which he has created, and which is another name, in many instances, for a sanctified love of power, an ambition to embody in himself the Church's power. He who happily sustains the married relation is in the best school on earth to learn unselfishness—the unselfish love of all. He is drawn out of himself; he must think of others; he cannot be absorbed in his own plans; his best affections are constantly moved upon, and they have no time to stagnate."

De Tocqueville, that astute French political philosopher, says: "I do not hesitate to say that the women give to every nation a moral temperament which shows itself in politics. A hundred times have I seen weak men show real public virtue because they had by their sides women who supported them, not by advice as to particulars, but by fortifying their feelings of duty, and of directing their ambition. More frequently, I must confess, I have observed the domestic influence gradually transforming a man naturally generous, noble, and unselfish, into a cowardly, commonplace, place-hunting self-seeker, thinking of public busi-

ness only as a means of making himself comfortable, and this simply by contact with a well-conducted woman, a faithful wife, an excellent mother, but from whose mind the grand notion of public duty was entirely absent."

A distinguished American author says: "The sympathy of a true Christian wife to a minister in his work is something more than common friendship; it is the loving support of a heart true to the divine Master in hours of human suffering and trial—in times when the spirit of a strong man bows itself, and when there is no other earthly friend to whom he would reveal his mental weakness and anguish."

The author of the "Recreations of a Country Parson," having been hindered in preparing a sermon by the frequent interruptions of his little child, says: "My sermon will be the better for all these interruptions. I do not mean to say that it will be absolutely good, though it will be as good as I can make it; but it will be better than it would have been if I had not been interrupted at all. The Roman Catholic Church meant it well, but it was far mistaken when it thought to make a man a better parish priest by cutting him off from domestic ties, and quite emancipating him from all the worries of domestic life. That might be the way to get men who would preach an unpractical religion, not human in interest, not able to comfort, direct, sustain through daily cares, tempta-

tions, and sorrows. But for the preaching which will come home to men's business and bosoms, which will not appear to ignore those things which must, of necessity, occupy the greatest part of an ordinary mortal's thoughts, commend me to the preacher who has learned by experience what are human ties, and what is human worry?"

But not only is the preacher's domestic circle blessed in the person of his wife, but, the quite general impression of the superficial observer to the contrary notwithstanding, the preacher's home life is blessed in the character of his children. The impression that preachers raise bad boys grows out of the fact that if a bad boy does happen to be a preacher's son everybody in the county knows it and talks about it, while if a man in any other calling has a bad boy it creates no surprise and therefore evokes no comment. If any man will examine carefully "Who's Who in America," (a work giving brief biographical sketches of outstanding men in American history) he will find that in proportion to numbers preachers have two sons in that list where men of any other calling have one. Take almost at random the following names from the great world of achievement in literature, science, business, politics, and religion: Joseph Addison, S. T. Coleridge, Wm. Cowper, Ben Johnson, Oliver Goldsmith, Alfred Tennyson, James Russell Lowell, Christopher Wren, Matthew Arnold, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Wm. Hazlett, Geo. Bancroft,

Froude, Parkman, Emerson, Henry Clay, Edward Everett, Kingsley, Mark Patterson, Wm. Stead, F. B. Morse, Cyrus W. Field, Chester A. Arthur, Levi P. Morton, Grover Cleveland, Lorimer of the *Saturday Evening Post,* Henry Ward Beecher, Jonathan Edwards, Canon Farrar, A. P. Stanley, Robert Hall, Norman McLeod, R. S. Storrs, Lyman Abbott, H. J. Van Dyke, Marcus Dods, C. H. Spurgeon. Trace their genealogy and you will find that they are all ministers' sons.

To come a little closer home and take the names of men personally known to most of the people who will read these lines: B. H. Carroll, R. C. Buckner, E. Y. Mullins, S. P. Brooks, C. C. Slaughter, L. R. Scarborough, O. S. Lattimore, Fred Freeman, J. M. Carroll, R. H. Coleman, and so on ad infinitum are the sons of ministers.

While I write two men are candidates for Governor of my native state—both of them the sons of preachers. At the same moment two men are candidates for President of the United States —one of them is the son of a Baptist, the other of a Presbyterian minister, and by the way one of these men is a Baptist deacon, the other a Presbyterian elder.

More than most men the preacher seems to have adopted as the motto of his home life Froebel's saying: "Let us live for the children," and he reaps the reward of faithfulness at this vital point. In the mouth of a preacher nothing could be more

tragic than the wail in Canticles 1: 6: "They have made me a keeper of the vineyards, but mine own vineyard have I not kept." Occasionally the preacher is guilty of the travesty on personal responsibility by giving himself to public service to the neglect of the preëminent duty of rearing his own family. There could be no greater folly and no more unspeakable tragedy.

2. *Spiritual Rewards.*

(*a*) *Consciousness of usefulness.* In any calling a man worth the name desires to be useful. In any legitimate calling the man who has the heart for it can make himself a blessing to the world, but it goes without saying that the preacher at this point has the advantage over all his brothers. In the first place this is true because of the very nature of his work. He works in the highest sphere of human life. That man is indeed a benefactor who makes two blades of grass grow where one originally grew. He is a benefactor who furnishes food and clothing for the human body. He is a benefactor who calls out and develops the latent powers of the human mind. But he is the highest benefactor who is permitted to give himself to the care of human souls,—who labours among men in the realm of the spiritual. What an appeal this fact makes for diligence and tact and consecration. How it challenges the preacher to put into his ministry the best powers that he has or that he may, by a life wholly devoted to it, acquire. Oh! men of

God, shepherds of souls, when we remember the exalted task that is ours how can we be sluggards or slackers!

But the preacher is conscious of his usefulness not only because of the nature of his work but because of gracious results he is often permitted to see growing out of his work. Looking back over his life the faithful minister sees the fruit of his labour in the many who have been led to Christ under his ministry; in the churches that have been planted and developed under his pastoral care; in communities that have been, under his leadership, lifted to higher planes of living; in altruistic movements that have been fostered and nurtured by his hand; in the wayward who have been reclaimed and the weak and dejected who have been steadied and heartened. Such rewards are worth to him more than gold, yea than much fine gold.

(*b*) Yet another spiritual reward that comes to the preacher is that more than other men he has the privilege of living in a high and holy atmosphere. A distinguished lawyer said to me not long since: "You preachers have an advantage over us lawyers. In our business we see human nature at its worst while in yours you see it at its best." Granting that he did not realize how much of the bad side of human nature the preacher sees, it must be admitted that there is truth in his statement. More than other men the preacher is associated with the best elements in the community. Who

can measure the blessings that come to him from such associations?

But association with good people is not the chief element in the high and holy atmosphere in which he lives. Far more potent than this is the fact that in his thought-world he deals with the high and holy. The very nature of his duties leads him to consider the holiest things. In his studies he lives in that atmosphere. In his ministrations whether in the pulpit or in pastoral visitation sacred things are preëminent. If he even measurably meets the demands of an ideal ministry his mind is saturated with the things of God. The truth is he lives in such constant touch with holy things that his great danger is that in his thinking they shall lose their holy aroma. Living in the atmosphere of these sacred things so constantly he is in danger of dealing with them in a purely professional spirit. The preacher is in a bad way when in his thinking holy things become commonplace and when the sacred functions of his office are performed mechanically. I have known some ministers who seemed to have degenerated to that low level, but as a rule the preacher's soul is enriched by the consciousness that he is ministering in holy things and his life is ennobled by this romantic truth.

(*c*) But a third spiritual reward is that more definitely than men in other callings the preacher has the promise of the presence of Jesus as he works. "Lo, I am with you alway" is a promise

made specifically to the man who preaches the Gospel and performs the duties of that high office. Every child of God yearns for the divine presence as he goes about his tasks. Indeed every child of God may have a consciousness of that presence, but to none is the promise of it made quite so definitely as to the preacher. Not only is this consciousness of the presence of Christ an immeasurable help to him in his work but it is a thing of real value in his life. To the right sort of preacher the promise of Christ's presence is a thing to be treasured among his most priceless jewels.

(*d*) Not the least of the preacher's rewards is in the fact that when he comes to the end of the journey there will be a host of people who have been blessed by his ministry to bid him an affectionate "good-night" as he slips into the shadow that we call death, and a still larger host to bid him a glad "good-morning" as he emerges into the glorious light on the other side.

In a lonely grave at the foot of the Apennines lies the body of a mountain guide. On a rude stone at the head of the grave is the inscription: "He was a good man and a good guide." What nobler compensation for a life of service and perhaps of sacrifice could a preacher have than that some such thing should be said of him when he has "crossed the bar"?

God help you, my young brother, that you may indeed be a good man and a good guide.

XIV

THE BISHOP-COADJUTOR OF THE OFFICE

"Help these women for they laboured with me in the Gospel."—PHILIPPIANS 4: 2.

OUR Episcopal brethren have an officer whom they style "Bishop-Coadjutor." The difference between the Bishop-Coadjutor and the ordinary assistant to the Bishop is that the latter functions only in temporalities while the Bishop-Coadjutor officiates in both temporal and spiritual matters. The minister's wife is the God-given Bishop-Coadjutor; she assists him both temporally and spiritually. Since she performs the duties of this office I see no reason why she should not receive the titles. "Therefore be it known by these presents," that in my thinking, every faithful wife of a minister is hereby designated, appointed and set apart to the high office of Bishop-Coadjutor.

Turning back to a thoroughly serious vein, permit me to say that I should count these lectures inexcusably incomplete if we did not give some consideration to the minister's wife by way, at once, of tribute, encouragement and instruction.

Dr. R. C. Burleson was wont to say in a somewhat jocular way that the devil had a spite against preachers and often paid them off in silly or incompetent wives. Like David when he averred that all men were liars, I think the dear Doctor was speaking in haste. A little deliberation would doubtless have compelled him to admit that preachers, for the most part, have been singularly fortunate in their wives. There are painful exceptions, to be sure, but generally speaking the "Mistress of the Manse" is the uncrowned queen among the women of her community. This is not the occasion to pronounce a fulsome eulogy on woman in general nor the minister's wife in particular. The truth is, though our writers and speakers seem not to know it, woman neither needs, nor desires, nor enjoys that sort of pabulum. She only asks opportunity and encouragement to do her part in the world's work. Like other human beings, she enjoys recognition, approval, appreciation, but more than most human beings she will go on faithfully in her work even when these are withheld.

A pulpit committee conferring with a prospective pastor asked about his wife. The somewhat sensitive preacher said, "You are not thinking of calling my wife, are you?" Whereupon one of the committee replied, "No, we ain't goin' to call her, but if we call you she's a-goin' to come." Properly mated, a woman is always interested in the plans and tasks and ambitions of her husband. It is on

this psychological basis that the minister's wife will be more interested in church work than other even devout women of the community. It is her *quasi* official connection with the church and the pastorate that justifies the introduction of this chapter in a book on the pastoral office.

In these days much is being said about woman and her relation to the world's work. The once quite prevalent notion that she is mentally inferior to man has been abandoned. Her capacity and her right to vote, hold office and perform any of the public functions hitherto discharged exclusively by men, is coming to be quite generally conceded. No longer a question of capacity, the problem now is how far it is right and expedient for her to go in filling public places and discharging public and official functions. The scope of this lecture will not permit us to go into the general questions of woman's rights and privileges in the world of politics and business. So far as the church is involved in the general question, the Scriptures clearly imply if they do not specifically teach that whatever may be her capacity or inherent right it is not expedient for her to be charged with official position in the church. This remark is not based wholly upon the so-called isolated and provincial statements of Paul but is a conclusion drawn from the entire trend of Scripture teaching. Whatever may be one's personal opinion, predilection or preference, all must admit that the Scriptures do not

contemplate and certainly do not provide for a woman filling either of the two official positions of a New Testament church. Her place in the church is clearly recognized and her work in it and for it definitely approved and encouraged, but that she is to fill either of its offices, or perform the official duties thereof is nowhere taught, but the contrary clearly implied. Her only homiletical right to a place in this discussion lies in her vital relation to the one whose office is the subject of these lectures.

Let this discussion begin with the consideration of some false attitudes of the church and the public generally toward the minister's wife.

(1) *Needless commiseration.* Some people think it is pious to pity the preacher's wife. The following doggerel from the *Chicago Record Herald* represents a view of her which is ridiculous to be sure, but quite prevalent.

Oh, pity the lot of a minister's wife;
It is sinful to be fair;
She must not try to seem too sublime for this life,
Yet must still have a heavenly air;
She must never view others with critical eyes.
She is there that the rest may themselves criticise
Whatever she does or may wear.

If she tries to be humble, her sisters will say
She poses and isn't sincere;
If she shows that she's proud of her prominence, they
Cast looks at each other and sneer,

And talk of the folly of one who believes
She's "too good for this world, while her husband receives
Only four or five thousand a year."

If she seems to be pleased with the sermon, the rest
Will think it is all for effect,
Yet she must not pretend to indifference lest
They may talk of her lack of respect;
They call her a frump if her costume is plain,
And accuse her of being extravagant, vain,
If she dares to be handsomely decked.

If she acts like a saint they will say it's for show,
If she doesn't there's scandal. Each day
She is under the gaze of the high and the low,
And though she inspires him, they
Regard the poor preacher with pity, they sigh,
And whispering sadly, go wondering why
He loves her so much, anyway.

There is nothing in her relation to the church to justify such a caricature. For her to accept the idea that she is the proper object of everybody's pity would rob her position of its romance and dethrone her noblest ideals. Next to self-pity, coveting or even tolerating pity from others, is perhaps the most enervating toxine. If she recognizes it and accepts it, it undermines her self-respect. If she recognizes it and resents it, it embarrasses and handicaps her activities. Ostentatious pity for the right-thinking, high-minded pastor's wife hurts her heart and hinders her work.

(2) *Undue exaltation.* The other extreme is that which puts the preacher's wife on a pedestal above other women. People who address other women as "Mrs." call the preacher's wife "Sister." Knowing that the distinction is fictitious and the making of it often hollow and hypocritical gives her a sickening sense of aloofness. Officially she is neither better nor worse, higher nor lower than other women and she chafes under an obsequious effort to apotheosize her. The feeling of aloofness thus generated wounds and handicaps her.

(3) *Excessive demands.* In many churches there is a disposition especially among the women to make a pack-horse of the pastor's wife. She is perhaps physically frail, the mother of children, financially unable to keep domestic help and yet is expected to teach in the Sunday school, direct the young people's work, be president of the women's society, visit the congregation, look after the sick and distressed and perform any miscellaneous tasks that may arise. While she has no official church position and is therefore not formally charged with responsibility above other women, yet being the wife of one who holds the highest official place in the church and whose whole life is given to its service, she would naturally take keener interest and have a larger part in the work of the church than the average woman. Not to do that would mark her a foolish woman. But having cheerfully

made that admission, I wish to enter a protest against the over-exacting demands too often made on her time and strength. If she is not a weakling to be coddled and pitied; if she is not a queen to be pampered and petted, neither is she a slave to be burdened that others may be eased.

But let us next inquire what kind of woman the pastor's wife ought to be. The Scriptures are silent on the subject unless γυναικας (wives) in 1 Timothy 3: 11 refers not only to deacons in verse 8, but also reaches back to bishops in verse 2. In which case it is required that they be sober-minded women, not slanderers, but temperate in every way and trustworthy in all things. Since her qualifications are not clearly delineated in revelation we shall seek such help as we may from reason and observation. In view of the work her husband is called to do, what sort of woman should the minister's wife seek to be?

While this book was brewing Mrs. E. O. Thompson, along with her preacher-husband, took my course of lectures on Pastoral Theology. During that period she wrote a paper on "The Minister's Wife." I am making some rather copious extracts from her discussion of the qualifications of a minister's wife.

"As to what a minister's wife ought to be, I should say first of all, a woman, every whit a woman, a woman with all the graces of heart, simplicity of demeanour and earnestness of life that it

takes to make a woman. She must cultivate and exemplify to the world in voluntary arts of devotion that womanliness in which the heart of Christ finds its supremest earthly expression. Abrupt manners, a raspy voice and careless habits discredit any woman and the display of them by a minister's wife is positively a calamity, because her prominence exhibits the value of culture and refinement and her position requires the highest personal attainments. Peevishness and narrow-mindedness are inconsistent with our ideal of womanhood in any sphere and in a minister's wife they are unbearable, because her example wields a mighty influence and her power for good demands breadth of vision and hopeful courage in meeting the trials and petty annoyances of life. So by all means let the minister's wife cultivate and exemplify all the womanly graces and attractiveness of which she is capable.

"Besides being a woman of gentle habits and gracious courtesy, the minister's wife should be an ideal companion for the minister and to do this she must be his compeer physically, intellectually and spiritually. Physically, woman is weaker than man, but this only argues for the care of the bodily temple so that it may be as efficient for a woman's work as man's is for his work. Life means joy, vigour and freedom from unnecessary pain and upon the soundness of health and physical fitness of the wife depends much of the minister's suc-

cess. But not only must a minister's wife strive to be well, but it is her duty to keep herself as attractive and lovable as she was before marriage, in fact it is well not only to abound in this grace but to grow in it also. The minister soon learns that it is much easier to secure a good pastorate than to maintain a good one and just as surely should the minister's wife realize that if personal attractiveness aided in awakening love it will do just as much, if not more, in increasing love. Many a man's admiration for his wife has been lost by unkempt hair and uncared-for hands and his devotion killed by ill-fitting dresses and soiled apparel. Costly material is not required, but a little ingenuity and a reasonable amount of care will work wonders and insure the personal attractiveness necessary for perfect happiness and extensive usefulness.

"But companionship does not rest alone on personal charms but must be sustained by mental activity and intellectual comradeship. Once upon a time in the far bygone days, men thought that because women were the weaker vessel they were also the smaller. In a more recent time they have realized that a fragile china bowl may hold as much as a heavy iron pot. To-day they not only acknowledge the possibility but demand the actuality. There is no reason why a minister's wife should not be his intellectual equal, for educational opportunities are as great for her as for him and

now special schools are built to train preachers' wives as well as aspirants for the position.

"But it takes more than personal attractiveness and intellectual equality to produce perfect comradeship. There must be a mating of the spiritual lives. The hearts of the minister and his wife, strangely drawn together, must quicken to the answering love of Jesus Christ, must dwell continually in His presence and trust without reserve in His promise, 'Lo, I am with you always.'"

Having given some time to discussing her qualifications for the task, let us now examine the task itself. What is the minister's wife to do?

1. *In the first place, barring providential disabilities, she is to be a mother.* It is important that she be a helper to her husband in the public work of the church. But there is a duty more ancient, more honourable and far more important than that. The preacher and his wife are wrong if they suppose that they are called upon to forego the privilege of parenthood that the wife may function unhampered in the public activities of the church. There is no such thing as an official preacher's-wifedom that precludes the duty, the privilege, and the honour of motherhood. Napoleon, so often wrong, was right when he said, "The greatest need of France is mothers." Cornelia put Motherhood in its right place of honour when she said, "Call me no longer the daughter of Scipio but call me the Mother of the Gracchi." On her monument, which stone

may be still seen in the Capitoline Museum at Rome, they inscribed at her request the simple words, "Cornelia, Mother of the Gracchi." It would have been nice if the Presbyterian minister's wife sixty years ago could have gone with her husband to Presbytery, Synod and General Assembly, but it was infinitely better that about that time she should bear and rear Woodrow Wilson. It would have been nice if the Baptist preacher's wife about that same time could have gone with her husband to Associations and Conventions and read brilliant reports before Women's Unions, but is it not a thousand times better that she was kept at home to care for her baby whose name was C. E. Hughes? If all preachers' wives had adopted the growing tendency to enforced barrenness in order that public functions might be discharged, the world would be darker by the absence of such luminaries as Addison, Coleridge, Cowper, Ben Johnson, Goldsmith, Tennyson, Lowell, Christopher Wren, Matthew Arnold, Holmes, Hazlett, Bancroft, Froude, Parkman, Emerson, Henry Clay, Edward Everett, Kingsley, Mark Patterson, Wm. Stead, F. B. Morse, Cyrus W. Field, Chester A. Arthur, Levi P. Morton, Grover Cleveland, Henry Ward Beecher, Jonathan Edwards, Canon Farrar, A. P. Stanley, Robert Hall, Norman McLeod, Richard Storrs, Lyman Abbott, Marcus Dods, C. H. Spurgeon, B. H. Carroll, Woodrow Wilson and C. E. Hughes, for these all were the

sons of preachers. They are not samples of one lonesome child in the home but almost without exception were one of a goodly group of brothers and sisters. History proves that a well-ordered parsonage affords ideal atmosphere for the growth of stalwart men and queenly women. The world's loss will be incalculable when the manse no longer rings with the merry shout of the preacher's children.

2. *But a second thing to be said about what the preacher's wife should do is that she should be a home keeper.* This does not imply that she should be chained Prometheus-like to the walls of the house in which she lives. It does mean, however, that she should recognize the duty, should be accorded the right and should be afforded the opportunity of making a home a real genuine home for herself, her husband and her children. We hear some talk of the "sacred desk" and the sanctity of the pulpit. I do not discount the value of these symbols of divine authority when I put the home above them as sources of power or symbols of holiness. The chivalrous man stands with solemn reverence by the stone that marks his mother's grave, and there are blessed memories that make it a sacred spot, but if there is a holy spot on this earth it is a home. To every right-thinking man home is the holy of holies, where he must walk with uncovered head and feet unsandalled. Whoever through greed or lust or pride or prejudice

destroys a home has committed the highest crime. Whoever by selfishness or thoughtlessness mars a home has spoiled earth's fairest and most fragrant flower. Whoever sacrifices home upon a petty ambition to shine in the world or upon a thought of doing more good in a supposedly larger sphere prostitutes the oldest, the holiest, the most beneficent of God's institutions. Paul was not speaking as a cynical old bachelor but as a wise philosopher and an inspired apostle when he wrote to a young preacher, "I will that younger women marry and guide the house."

3. *But added to motherhood and home-making, the minister's wife has the duty of helping her husband in his duties.* She will not write his sermons nor drill him in their delivery. She will not make his pastoral visits nor habitually accompany him when he makes them, but she will put forth an unseen but potent hand on these and all his other tasks. Her delicate touch and intuitional interpretation of trying situations will cover a multitude of masculine sins. A wise wife often saves the preacher from the blunders of others and more often saves him from his own folly. Some of us preachers are so inherently bent toward blundering that we remind ourselves and all thoughtful observers of an ox in a crockery house. But for the chastening, mellowing, restraining, inspiring and usually silent influence of a good wife some of us long ago would have smashed every shelf in the

shop. Sometimes when like John Mark, we have lain down in the harness she has, figuratively at least, picked us up and carried us out on her shoulders. When Guelph of Bavaria surrendered to Conrad III, his wife requested for herself and her lady companions immunity for themselves and whatever they could carry out of the castle. The request being granted all were astonished to see them coming forth bearing their husbands on their backs. Known unto me is the preacher, and his name is Legion, who has ridden into all his noble achievements on the back of a devoted wife.

"Oh! Woman Mother! Woman Wife!
Sweetest name the language knows.
Thy heart with pure affections rife,
Thy bosom with purest motive glows.
Thou queen, thou angel of my life,
Few are the friends my life hath made,
Few are they who in my hand their hearts
have laid
And these were women.
I am old and never yet have I been
betrayed."

But the repertoire of the pastor's wife is not confined to motherhood, home-making and being a silent partner in her husband's achievements. She has *her own definite work, a work* peculiar to her position, a work growing out of her quasi-official connection with the church and a work therefore of such nature that it cannot be done by any other

woman. Now what is to be the nature of her work in the church? (*a*) *In the first place, it must not be perfunctory.* Like her husband, she is constantly tempted to do her work professionally. She must pray daily for freshness, fervour, spontaneity. Holy spiritual fires must be kept burning in her heart lest her church activities become mechanical. The woman who makes "pastor's-wifing" a profession is a very unsatisfactory individual. The woman who is active in the church during her husband's pastorate but loses all interest when his pastorate ceases is not worth anything now and really was not worth much then. (*b*) *Again, she must not be domineering. She must lead but not boss and her leadership must be from the rear and not from the front.* She must know, and if she does not know she must learn, how to enlist and encourage others. The wisest woman I ever knew always maintained that the pastor's wife should never be president of the woman's society. Nobody ever thought of her as a leader in any movement. She never held office nor wore any badge of leadership, but she was the dominant spirit among the women in every church where her husband has been pastor. She gained ascendency by following two maxims,—First, Keep yourself out of sight, and Second, Let all your plans be unselfish. When the women in a church discover that the plans of the pastor's wife point toward the parsonage or any other personal or selfish end then

and there she drops her sceptre of power and can never pick it up. Blessings on the pastor's wife who is qualified for leadership, knows how to lead from the rear and is willing to lead for the glory of Christ. I bare my head in her saintly presence. The other kind gives me neurasthenia, which being interpreted is nervous prostration.

(*c*) *But there is yet another sphere where the pastor's wife may, as such, make herself useful—the community at large.* She will probably not be a club woman, certainly not a society woman, but even though she is a mother and her husband's church is large she ought to find some time for lending a hand in enterprises of general community interest. Aside from the specific good done, such activities broaden her sympathies, extend her acquaintance and enlarge the sphere of her influence.

In conclusion, let me give a word of exhortation to my young preacher brothers: See that your wife has a chance to grow while you grow. I am thinking now of a preacher who when an ignorant boy married a noble but uneducated girl. Afterwards called to preach, the churches took him up and educated him. In middle life he is an educated, cultured gentleman. With little opportunity and perhaps no encouragement for self-culture the wife has remained a noble but ignorant woman. Worse than that, she is a heart-broken woman because she feels herself to be a millstone about her husband's neck. Worse than all that, the work of the King-

dom is hindered because even the trained pastor cannot do his best with such a handicap. I am a sentimental believer in love, even in love at first sight, in the irrevocable, once for all, divinely ordered mating of souls. I am, therefore, against the preacher who selects a wife as he would pick a horse, because he thinks she has qualities fitting her to the job of preacher's wifedom. When as a youth they told me that a given young woman would make a fine preacher's wife, I always let her alone. I was not hunting for a woman to take a job—to fill a position. I was waiting for some one to come my way, whether Barbarian, Scythian, bond or free, whose soul would respond to my own —and thank God she came. The brethren feared, not entirely without ground, that she would not make a good pastor's wife. But thank God she did. But having in all sincerity said all this, let me further say that the beginning and perpetuity of this mating of souls is based not on physical charms but on intellectual and spiritual comradeship. If woman and man do not grow together mentally and spiritually this soul harmony is marred and all the romance is gone out of life. Take the romance out of life and it is a desert—stale, flat and unprofitable. Therefore, give the young preacher's wife a chance to grow even as her husband grows.

Printed in the United States of America

Date Due

MAY 16 1972

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137

BV
660
.R263

51937

Ray, J. D.
The highest office.

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME
5-2-72	David A. Olson

DEMCO